In Memoriam

THE REVEREND ARTHUR ROMEYN GRAY, D.D.

Born Bergen Point, New Jersey, December 30, 1875.

Son of George Zabriskie and Kate Forrest Gray.

Died in New York City, January 11, 1933.

Educated at Groton Academy, Columbia University, and Oxford.

Ordained Deacon, 1900, and Priest, 1901, in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Professor of Apologetics, 1901-11, the University of the South, Sewanee, and Chaplain, 1908-11.

Developed The University Press, and later presented it to the University.

Educational Secretary and Latin-American Secretary of Board of Missions of the Church, 1911-30.

Member of staff of Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, 1930-33.

He edited and published the SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, as follows:

The Doctrine of the Church—By Rt. Rev. Dr. A. C. A. Hall

The Book of Common Prayer—by Rev. Dr. Samuel Hart

Christian Apologetics—By Rev. Dr. Arthur R. Gray

Manual of Early Ecclesiastical History—by Rev. Dr. Charles L. Wells

Church History, Medieval and Modern—by Rev. Dr. William Lloyd Bevan

The Old Testament—by Rev. Dr. Loring W. Batten

The remaining volumes of this series are being distributed by the University of the South through the generosity of Dr. Gray's family.

August 1, 1953.

Class 270.1R Book W465 C.2

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY

University of the South

MANUAL OF EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GENERAL EDITOR — The Rev. ARTHUR R. GRAY, sometime Chaplain of the University of the South.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, by the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Vermont.

"It is at once most comprehensive and most condensed; and its dealing with some of the difficult and important questions of our time, such as the Resurrection, the Incarnation, and especially the Atonement, is a remarkable piece of clear theological statement and logical argument."—Rt. Rev. W. C. DOANE.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, by the Very Rev. SAMUEL HART, D.D., LL.D., Dean of Berkeley Divinity School.

"It is admirably adapted to the uses of students of theology, and is, beyond comparison, the best book of its kind for the reading of Churchmen in general."—Dr. GEORGE HODGES, *Dean of the Episcopal Theological School.*

APOLOGETICS, by the General Editor.

"Distinctly pragmatic, but also thoroughly theistic."—Dr. W. P. DUBOSE.

"This volume has many excellencies; but the chief of them is its masterly exposure of the claims of Naturalism."—*Princeton Theological Review.*

MANUAL OF EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY TO 476 A.D., by the Very Rev. CHAS. L. WELLS, Ph.D., Lecturer in History, McGill University, Montreal; sometime Dean of Christ Church Cathedral, New Orleans.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY FROM 476 A.D., by the Rev. WILSON LLOYD BEVAN, Ph.D., Professor of History and Economics, University of the South. (In Preparation.)

THE OLD TESTAMENT, by the Rev. LORING W. BATTEN, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the Old Testament, General Theological Seminary. (In Preparation.)

THE NEW TESTAMENT. (To be arranged for.)

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, by the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAM DOUGLAS, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. (In Preparation.)

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (To be arranged for.)

*** *In uniform volumes, 12-mo. cloth, printed on imported English paper, price $1.50 per volume, post prepaid.*

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
OF SEWANEE TENNESSEE

SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

MANUAL OF EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

TO 476 A. D.

BY

CHARLES L. WELLS, Ph. D.

LECTURER IN HISTORY, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINN.
AUTHOR OF "THE AGE OF CHARLEMAGNE."

The University Press
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

270.1R
W465
c2
124510

Copyright, 1912
By The University Press of
Sewanee Tennessee

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE object of this series is to provide for the clergy and laity of the Church a statement, in convenient form, of its Doctrine, Discipline and Worship—as well as to meet the often expressed desire on the part of Examining Chaplains for text-books which they could recommend to candidates for Holy Orders.

To satisfy, on the one hand, the demand of general readers among the clergy and laity, the books have been provided with numerous references to larger works, making them introductory in their nature; and on the other hand, to make them valuable for use in canonical examinations, they have been arranged according to the canons of the Church which deal with that matter.

It is the earnest hope of the collaborators in this series that the impartial scholarship and unbiased attitude adopted throughout will commend themselves to Churchmen of all types, and that the books will therefore be accorded a general reception and adopted as far as possible as a *norm* for canonical examinations. The need of such a norm is well known to all.

And finally a word to Examining Chaplains. They will find that the volumes are so arranged that it will

be possible to adapt them to all kinds of students. The actual text itself should be taken as the *minimum* of requirement from the candidate, and then, by reference on their part to the bibliographies at the end of each chapter, they can increase as they see fit the amount of learning to be demanded in each case. It has been the endeavor of the editor to make these bibliographies so comprehensive that Examining Chaplains will always find suitable parallel readings.

If in any way the general public will be by this series encouraged to study the position of the Church, and if the canonical examinations in the different dioceses can be brought into greater harmony one with another, our object will be accomplished.

ARTHUR R. GRAY.

PREFACE

THIS little book falls in line with and seeks to carry out the general purpose of the series. Its special aim is to give such a brief, connected yet sufficiently analytical account of the history as to make it serve alike the purpose of the special student and of the intelligent reader.

While the effort is made not to omit any facts or names or topics of real importance, their full and complete consideration is left to larger works to which references are given. Special references are given at the end of each section. References to the bibliography at the beginning of the book are, in most cases, omitted, as the indexes to each volume will supply them. A few occasional references on special points are introduced into the text where it is deemed advantageous.

Detailed chronological divisions of the period are made, sometimes at the expense of the continuity of a single topic, in order to emphasize and make possible a definite picture of each step in the development and to place it in its immediate chronological environment, that the events of the period may be seen in close relation to the other conditions of the time in which they belong.

The placing of the final limit of the early period at 476 A.D. needs some explanation and perhaps justification. It is true that the importance of that year has been greatly overestimated, and that even the significance which it does possess was not recognized in the fifth century, but it coincides with so many events besides that of the accession of Odovaker to the throne of Italy and the sending of the imperial insignia of the West back to Constantinople, that it seems right to adopt it, following the lead of the learned Dr. Hans von Schubert in his exceedingly valuable revision of Moeller's Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.

The year 476 marks the end of the close connection between the East and the West; the foundation of the Papacy by Leo I; the close of the period of the first four, and most important, General Councils by that of Chalcedon, 451 A.D. The next events in chronological order also mark the beginning of a new period; the beginning of the great Frankish Power by the emergence of Clovis and his baptism, 496 A.D., and the beginning of the English nation by the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain, begun 449 A.D., but not completed until a century and a half later.

The whole period has been subdivided into two periods, and these again into five divisions, in order to fix the attention on definite and well-marked stages in the development, and also to note the most signifi-

cant epochs in the history. It must be understood, however, that the floor of the long hall of history is not laid in boards of equal length, and that some movements beginning in one period extend into a succeeding one, and that within any single period there is a progress of development. With this caution the divisions will be found helpful alike to the memory and the understanding.

In treating the various periods the attempt is made to give the latest and most scholarly opinion and view of each topic, and to give a complete list of the valuable and most recent contributions accessible to the English student, though it has not been possible nor is it deemed expedient to make any reference to even valuable magazine articles or reviews, owing largely to space and time limitations. In some cases almost direct quotations are made from works mentioned in the bibliographical lists, without any further acknowledgment.

A brief characterization of the nature and value of the works has been attempted as a guide, but such estimates are largely personal and must be treated as such. Dates are given whenever possible and as accurately as possible in order to fix the chronological relation of events, although early dates are uncertain and changes are being made continually. It is to be remembered that the date of a man's death is much more important than that of his birth, as

serving to fix more nearly the period of his largest activity.

The book is an honest and conscientious effort to treat a subject, filled with controversy and wide divergence of opinion, from the standpoint of the scholar rather than from that of the partisan; but there is no shrinking from stating conclusions or making inferences where it is deemed proper and helpful.

I would be very grateful for any corrections or suggestions which may be made. The writing of a book, in history particularly, is a coöperative, not an individual act.

C. L. W.

Montreal, March, 1912.

ANALYTICAL OUTLINE
4 B.C. TO 476 A.D.

A. FIRST PERIOD

THE APOSTOLIC AND THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH: FROM THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST TO THE EDICT OF MILAN. 4 B.C. TO 313 A.D.

CHAPTER I. FIRST DIVISION. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY: FROM THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST TO THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN AND THE ACCESSION OF THE EMPEROR TRAJAN. 4 B.C. TO 98 A.D.

§1. INTRODUCTORY.— Preparation for Christianity 3
(1) In the East 5
(2) In the Græco-Roman World 6
(3) In Judaism 7
(4) The Roman Empire at the Birth of Jesus 7
§2. Jesus Christ and the Origins of Christianity 10
§3. The Church in Jerusalem 12
§4. St. Paul and the Gentile Church 17
§5. St. Peter and the Roman Church 19
§6. St. James, St. John and the other Apostles 20
§7. Worship and Organization 22
§8. The Spread of Christianity and Early Persecutions 30

CHAPTER II. SECOND DIVISION. THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE: FROM THE ACCESSION OF TRAJAN TO THE DEATH OF MARCUS AURELIUS. 98 A.D. TO 180 A.D.

§1. The Spread of Christianity 35
§2. The Persecutions under "The Good Emperors" 38

§3. The Apostolic Fathers 40
§4. The Christian Apologists 42
§5. Ebionism and the Pseudo-Clementine System 45
§6. Gnosticism 47
§7. Marcion and his Churches 53
§8. Montanus and Montanism 56
§9. The Consolidation of the Catholic Church 59
§10. The Rule of Faith 63
§11. The Canon of Scripture 65
§12. Baptism 67
§13. The Eucharist 69
§14. Festivals and Holy Days 70
§15. Christian Life and Discipline 73
§16. The Intellectual Attack 76

CHAPTER III. THIRD DIVISION. THE OLD CATHOLIC AGE: FROM THE DEATH OF MARCUS AURELIUS TO THE EDICT OF MILAN. 180 A.D. TO 313 A.D.

§1. The Spread of Christianity 78
§2. The Church and the Empire; The Persecutions 79
§3. Theological Schools and Tendencies 86
§4. The Theology of the Church 100
§5. The Intellectual Attack 112
§6. Mani and Manichæism 113
§7. The Catholic Church 117
(1) Organization; The Hierarchy 117
(2) Synods 122
(3) The Metropolitans 123
(4) The Primacy of Rome and Ecclesiastical Unity 125
§8. Baptism 131
§9. The Eucharist and Christian Worship 132
§10. Church Buildings and the Catacombs 136
§11. Christian Life and Discipline 140
§12. Schisms 142

B. SECOND PERIOD

The Imperial Church and the First Four General Councils: From the Edict of Milan to the End of the Roman Empire in the West. 313 A.D. to 476 A.D.

Chapter I. First Division. The Establishment of the Imperial Church and the Nicene Faith: From the Edict of Milan to the Division of the Empire at the Death of Theodosius. 313 A.D. to 395 A.D.

§1. The Empire of Constantine and his Successors in Relation to the Christian Church and the Overthrow of Paganism 145
§2. The Intellectual Attack 155
§3. The Spread of Christianity 156
§4. The Establishment of Christianity among the Germans, Ulfilas and the Goths 158
§5. The Clergy 163
§6. The Patriarchal Constitution 166
§7. The Roman Primacy 167
§8. Theological Schools and Tendencies 172
§9. The Trinitarian Controversy and the First Two General Councils: Nicæa, 325 A.D., and Constantinople I, 381 A.D. 177
§10. Apollinaris and the Beginning of the Christological Controversy 185
§11. Priscillianism and Heresy 186
§12. Monasticism 191
§13. Christian Worship and Holy Days 194
§14. Architecture 200
§15. Ecclesiastical Law and Episcopal Courts 202

CHAPTER II. SECOND DIVISION. THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE NICENE FAITH AND THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE IMPERIAL CHURCH: FROM THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS TO THE END OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE WEST. 395 A.D. TO 476 A.D.

§1. The End of Paganism in the Empire..... 206
(1) In the East..... 206
(2) In the West..... 207
§2. The Ecclesiastical Organism..... 209
§3. The Roman Primacy and the Origins of the Papacy.. 211
§4. The Invasion of the Germans..... 216
§5. St. Patrick and the Islands of the West..... 220
§6. Origenistic Controversies..... 222
§7. Augustine and the Theology of the West..... 223
§8. The Donatists..... 227
§9. The Pelagian Controversy; Semi-Pelagianism..... 231
§10. The Christological Controversy..... 235
(1) The Nestorian Controversy and the Third General Council at Ephesus, 431 A.D..... 235
(2) The Eutychian Controversy and the Fourth General Council at Chalcedon, 451 A.D..... 238
§11. The Canon of Scripture..... 241
§12. The Sacraments..... 243
§13. Worship; Rites and Ceremonies; Services and Liturgies..... 249
§14. Saints, Relics and Images..... 251
§15. Christian Life and Discipline..... 255

TABLE OF ROMAN EMPERORS AND CONTEMPORARY BISHOPS OF ROME

(The dates assigned to the bishops of the first two centuries are conjectural.)

Augustus, 27 B.C.–14 A.D.	
Tiberius, 14–37	
Caius, 37–41	
Claudius, 41–54	
Nero, 54–68	St. Paul and St. Peter in Rome.
Galba, 68	
Otho, 69	
Vitellius, 69	
Vespasian, 69–79	Linus, 67–79
Titus, 79–81	Anencletus, Anacletus or Cletus, 79–91
Domitian, 81–96	Clement I, 91–100
Nerva, 96–98	Evaristus, 100–108
Trajan, 98–117	Alexander, 108–117
	Xystus or Sixtus I, 117–126
Hadrian, 117–138	Telesphorus, 126–137
	Hyginus, 137–141
Antoninus Pius, 138–161	Pius I, 141–154
	Anicetus, 154–166
Marcus Aurelius, 161–180	Soter, 166–174
Commodus, 180–192	Eleutherus, 174–189
Pertinax, Didius Julianus, 193	Victor I, 189–202
Septimius Severus, 193–211	
Geta (d. 212), and Caracalla, 211–217	Zephyrinus, 202–217
Macrinus, 217–218	
Heliogabalus, 218–222	Callistus or Calixtus I, 217–222
	Urban I, 222-230
Alexander Severus, 222–235	Pontianus, 230–235
Maximin, 235–238	

Gordian, I and II, 238		Anterus, 235–236
Gordian III, 238–244		
Philip the Arabian, 244–249		Fabian, 236–250
Decius, 249–251		See vacant, 250–251
Gallus, 251–254		Cornelius, 251–253
Hostilian, 251–252		
Æmilian, 253–254		Lucius, 253–254
		Stephen, 254–257
Valerian, 254–260		Sixtus II, 257–258
		See vacant, 258–259
Gallienus, 260–268		Dionysius, 259–268
Claudius Gothicus, 268–270		
Aurelian, 270–275		Felix I, 269–274
Tacitus, 275–276		
Florian, 276		
Probus, 276–282		
Carus, 282–283		Eutychianus, 275–283
Numerian, 283–284		
Carinus, 283–285		
Diocletian, 284–286		
Diocletian (E.); Maximian (W.), 286–292		Gaius, 283–296
Diocletian (E. Aug.); Maximian (W. Aug.)	292–305	
Galerius (E. Cæs.); Constantius (W. Cæs.)		Marcellinus, 296–304
Galerius (E. Aug.); Constantius (W. Aug.)	305–306	
Maximin (E. Cæs.); Severus (W. Cæs.)		See vacant, 304–307
Severus (W., d. 307); Maximin (W., d. 310)	306–313	Marcellus, 307–309
Galerius (E., d. 311); Maxentius (W., d. 312)		Eusebius, 309
		See vacant, 309–310
Maximin (E., d. 313); Constantine (W.); Licinius (E.)		Melchiades, 310–314

Licinius (E.); Constantine (W.), 313–323
Constantine (E. and W.), 323–337
Constantine II, Constans, Constantius, 337–340
Constans, Constantius, 340–350
Constantius, 350–361
Gallus (W. Cæs.), 350–354
Julian (W. Cæs.), 354–361
Julian, 361–363
Jovian, 363
Valens (E.), 364–378
Valentinian I (W.), 364–375
Gratian (W.), 375–383
Maximus (W.), 383–388
Valentinian II (W.), 375–392
Theodosius (E.), 379–392
Theodosius (E. and W.), 392–395

Silvester, 314–335
Marcus, 336
Julius I, 337–352
Liberius, 352–366
Felix II (?), 355–365
Damasus, 366–384
Siricius, 384–398

East	*West*	
Arcadius, 395–408	Honorius, 395–423	Anastasius I, 398–402
Theodosius II, 408–450		Innocent I, 402–417
		Zosimus, 417–418
		Boniface I, 418–422
	Valentinian III, 423–455	Cœlestine I, 422–432
		Sixtus III, 432–440
Marcian, 450–457	Maximus, 455–457	
Leo I, 457–474	Majorian, 457–461	Leo I, 440–461
	Lybius Severus, 461–465	Hilary, 461–468
	Anthemius, 467–472	
	Olybius, 472	
	Julius Nepos, 472–475	
Zeno, 474–491	Romulus Augustulus, 475–476	Simplicius, 468–483

LIST OF IMPORTANT COUNCILS AND SYNODS

First Period

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Second Century		
c. 150–175	Asia Minor.	Against Montanism.
c. 175–200	Rome.	The date of Easter.
Third Century		
c. 218–222	Carthage.	Baptism of heretics void. Against the Montanists.
c. 230–235	Iconium.	Baptism by heretics void.
231	Alexandria.	Against Origen.
244	Bostra.	Against Beryllus and Patripassians.
249	Carthage.	Priests not to be guardians.
251	Carthage.	Restoration of lapsed. Upholding Cyprian.
251	Rome.	Excommunicated Novatian.
252	Carthage.	Restoration of lapsed to prepare for battle. Baptism of infants not to be delayed till eighth day.
255–256	Carthage.	Three synods against baptism by heretics.
c. 255–260	Arsinoe.	Against Nepos and the Millenarians.
262	Rome.	Against Dionysius of Alexandria.
264, 5–9	Antioch.	Three synods against Paul of Samosata and Sabellianism.
Fourth Century		
305	Cirta.	Traditores. (Anecdote, Hefele I, p.129)
306	Alexandria.	Against Meletius.
306	Elvira.	Sin after baptism; Sacrifice to idols; Clergy in business and marriage; Fasting; Against pictures in churches; Celebration of Pentecost; Catechumenate of two years; Against marrying deceased wife's sister; Against actors and pantomimes.

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Fourth Century		
313	Rome.	Upheld Cecilian. Condemned Donatus.
		SECOND PERIOD
314	Arles.	Imperial Council. Against Donatists.
314	Ancyra.	Regulations for the clergy.
314–325	Neo-Cæsarea.	Age for ordination of a presbyter, 30 years.
320	Alexandria.	Condemned Arius.
325	NICÆA.	THE FIRST GENERAL COUNCIL.
330	Antioch.	Deposed Eustathius.
334	Cæsarea.	Athanasius refused to appear.
335	Tyre.	Condemned and deposed Athanasius.
335	Constantinople.	Condemned Athanasius. (Exiled by the Emperor.) Deposed Marcellus.
c. 338–339	Constantinople.	Eusebian. Deposed Paul of Constantinople.
339	Alexandria.	Endorsed Athanasius.
340	Antioch.	Deposed Athanasius.
341	Rome.	Upheld Athanasius and Marcellus.
341	Antioch.	"Council of the Dedication." Twenty-five canons, four compromise creeds. Eusebian; avoided Arian and Nicene extremes; condemned Athanasius and Marcellus.
343	Sardica.	Nicene. Twenty-one canons.
	Philippopolis.	Eusebian.
344	Antioch.	Condemned Photinus. The "Prolix Exposition."
345	Milan.	Condemned Photinus.
351	Sirmium I.	Eusebian. Homoousios rejected. Accepted fourth Antiochian creed. Deposed Photinus and Marcellus.
353	Arles.	Condemned Athanasius, and banished those who refused to subscribe.
355	Milan.	Condemned Athanasius, and banished those who refused to subscribe.

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Fourth Century		
356	Biterrae.	Condemned Athanasius.
357	Sirmium II.	Anomœan. "Blasphemy of Sirmium."
358	Antioch.	Extreme Arian. Anomœan.
358	Ancyra.	Semi-Arian. Condemned Anomœans.
358	Sirmium III.	Semi-Arian; like Sirmium I.
359	Sirmium IV.	Dated Creed. Homœan.
359	Nice (not Nicæa).	Homœan Creed.
359	Rimini.	Adopted Arian Creed of Nice.
359	Seleucia.	Homœan.
360	Constantinople.	Ulfilas present. Adopted Creed of Nice. Deposed Semi-Arians.
361	Paris.	Upheld Homoousios and the Nicene Creed.
362	Alexandria.	Attempt to win back the Meletians and to establish harmony.
363	Alexandria.	Declared the Nicene faith.
363	Antioch.	Meletians accepted the Nicene Creed.
c. 360–370	Gangra.	Discipline. Asceticism.
c. 370–380	Laodicea.	Regulation of the Canon. Discipline.
374	Valence.	Discipline.
375	Illyria.	Against Pneumatomachians.
375	Ancyra.	Arian; deposed Gregory of Nyssa.
376	Iconium.	Nicene. Upheld Basil.
378	Antioch.	Homoiousios.
	Milan.	Approved Nicene faith.
380	Rome.	Condemned Apollinaris and confirmed Damasus.
380	Saragossa.	Against the Priscillianists.
381	CONSTANTINOPLE.	THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL.
381	Aquileia.	Against Arians, Meletians and Apollinarians.
	Milan.	
382	Constantinople.	Emphatic assertion of the Trinity and the Incarnation.
	Rome.	Condemned Apollinarians.

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Fourth Century		
383	Constantinople.	Each party presented a creed. All except the Nicene destroyed by Theodosius.
384	Bordeaux.	Against the Priscillianists.
385	Treves.	Upheld Ithacius.
386	Rome.	Discipline.
390	Rome. Milan.	Against Jovinian, who opposed asceticism.
393	Hippo.	Regulation of the Canon. Discipline.
393–424	Carthage.	Twenty synods under Aurelius. Numbered consecutively. Discipline. Important. Sunday, actors and pagan banquets.
394	Nimes.	Against the Priscillianists. Concerning slavery.
394	Constantinople.	A bishop can be deposed only by a greater synod.
397	Carthage.	Confirmed the decisions of Hippo.
399	Alexandria. Jerusalem. Cyprus.	Against Origen.
400	Toledo.	Against the Priscillianists. Discipline.
Fifth Century		
402	Mileve.	Discipline.
402	Rome.	Celibacy of the higher clergy. Instructions to the Gallican bishops.
403	Chalcedon.	Ad Quercum. (Estate of the Imperial Prefect Rufinus.) Against Chrysostom.
404	Constantinople.	Against Chrysostom.
411	Carthage.	Conference of Donatists and Catholics.
411	Carthage.	Condemned Cælestius.
415	Jerusalem. Diospolis.	Refused to condemn Pelagius.
416	Carthage. Mileve.	Condemned Pelagius and appealed to Innocent I.

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Fifth Century		
417	Rome.	Refused to condemn Pelagius.
418	Carthage.	Condemned Pelagianism. Forbade appeals to Rome.
419	Carthage.	Led to collection of Canons.
420	Seleucia.	Led to collection of Canons still in use in the East.
426	Constantinople.	Against the Euchites.
429	Troyes.	Against Pelagianism. Sent Bishop Germanus and Lupus to Britain.
430	Rome. Alexandria.	Against Nestorius.
431	EPHESUS.	THE THIRD GENERAL COUNCIL.
431	Constantinople. Tarsus. Antioch.	Echoes of Ephesus.
432	Constantinople. Antioch.	Attempts at reconciliation between Cyril and John of Antioch.
433	Antioch.	Attempt at reconciliation.
434	Antioch.	Defended Theodore of Mopsuestia.
439	Riez.	Uncanonical ordinations. "When times are peaceable," two synods annually.
441	Orange.	Penitential discipline. Regulations for clergy and widows.
442	Vaison.	Regulation for clergy and bequests.
443 or 452	Arles II.	Several Provinces. Previous Canons confirmed. Regulations for clergy, synods and penitents.
444	Rome.	Against the Priscillianists.
446	Astorga.	Against the Priscillianists.
447	Toledo.	Against the Priscillianists. Affirmed the *filioque*, following a statement by Leo I.
447	St. Albans.	Against Pelagianism.

Date	*Place*	*Action*
Fifth Century		
447	Rome.	Against bishops squandering Church property.
448	Antioch.	Accusers of Ibas excommunicated.
448	Constantinople.	Excommunicated Eutyches.
449	Ephesus.	Latrocinium. "Synod of Brigands."
449	Rome.	Rejected the Synod of Brigands.
c. 450-456	Ireland.	Regulations for clergy, and discipline.
451	Milan.	Endorsed Leo's letter to Flavian.
451	CHALCEDON.	THE FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL.
453	Constantinople.	Accepted Leo's letter, except protest against Canon 28 of Chalcedon.
453	Angers.	Regulations for clergy, monks and penitents.
458	Rome.	Baptism of those taken captive in childhood. Baptism by heretics valid.
461	Tours.	Regulations for clergy, and discipline.
464	Arles.	Discipline.
464	Tarragona.	Appealed to Pope Hilary.
465	Rome.	Discipline; answer to Spain.
471	Antioch.	Deposed Peter the Fuller, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch.
472	Bourges.	Election of a Metropolitan.
c. 472	Vienne.	Endorsed processional litanies.
c. 475	Arles and Lyons.	Semi-Pelagian victory. Condemned the Predestinarians.

See Hefele, C. J., History of the Councils of the Church. Translated. Alphabetical list of Synods. Vol. V, pp. 452–462. Edinb., 1895.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Atlases and Chronologies

Labberton, R. H.—New Historical Atlas and General History. N. Y., 1890.

Koeppen, A. L.—The World in the Middle Ages. 2 vols. N. Y., 1854.

Dow, E. W.—Atlas of European History. N. Y., 1907.

Tarner, G. E.—Concise Tabular View of the Outlines of Christian History. Lond., 1890.

Heussi, K., and Mulert, H.—Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte. 66 maps, 8vo. Tubingen, 1905. The best small modern atlas.

Wiltsch, J. E. F.—Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church. Trans., 2 vols. Lond., 1859. Useful.

II. Dictionaries and Encyclopædias

Encyclopædia Britannica. Eleventh edition.—Articles by Harnack, Duchesne and others.

Cheyne and Black.—Encyclopædia Biblica. 4 vols. N. Y., 1899-1903. Largely by German scholars with reference to German books. Critical, scholarly, and rationalistic.

Hastings, James.—Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. 2 vols. N. Y., 1906-1908.

Hastings, James.—Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. To be completed in 12 vols. N. Y., 1908 ff.

Hastings, James.—Dictionary of the Bible. 5 vols. N. Y., 1898-1904. Critical and scholarly. Mostly by English and American scholars.

Smith and Wace.—Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines. To the age of Charlemagne. 4 vols. Boston, 1877-1887.

Smith and Cheetham.—Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. To the time of Charlemagne. 2 vols. Boston, 1875-1880.

The two dictionaries mentioned above contain valuable and scholarly monographs by the best English scholars.

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.—Revised by S. M. Jackson, based on the famous German work by Hauck-Herzog. To be completed in 12 vols. N. Y., 1908 ff.

Bingham, J.—Christian Antiquities. 2 vols. Still of much value.

Blunt, J. H.—Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. 2d ed. Phil., 1891.

Blunt, J. H.—Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties and Schools of Religious Thought. 2d ed. Phil., 1886. Two works for handy reference.

Jackson, S. M.—Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer. N. Y., 1893.

Larned, J. N.—History for Ready Reference. 7 vols. Springfield, 1911.

The last two volumes are supplementary, dealing with modern history from 1894 to 1911.

Wright and Neill.—A Protestant Dictionary of the History, Doctrines and Practices of the Christian Church. Lond., 1904.

The Catholic Encyclopædia.—To be completed in 15 vols. N. Y., 1907 ff.

The Jewish Encyclopædia.—12 vols. N. Y., 1902-1905.

III. General Church Histories, Covering Several Periods

Mosheim, John Laurence von.—(a) Institutions of Christian History; (b) Historical Commentaries on the First Three Centuries to 350 A.D. Written in Latin, 1750. Translated and edited by James Murdock. N. Y., 1874.

Mosheim is the founder of modern scientific Church history. Though his work is now generally superseded, it is the work of a thorough, conscientious scholar. It is arranged in the Centurial form and lacks philosophical insight.

Neander, J. A. W.—General History of the Christian Religion and Church to 1430 A.D. 12th ed. 6 vols. Boston, 1881.

"A giant in learning and a saint in piety." His work shows profound learning and a deep devotional spirit. It was completed in 1852, and lacks the results of modern scholarship. But it is especially strong, and still very valuable in all that concerns theology, the spiritual life, biography and analysis of character. Little attention is paid to matters affecting external order, organization and political relations; but everything connected with the inner spiritual history of the Church is clearly and exhaustively portrayed. His purpose is "to exhibit the history of the Church of Christ as a living witness of the divine power of Christianity; as a school of Christian experience."

Gieseler, J. C. L.—A Textbook of Church History, to 1648 A.D., continued to 1848 A.D. by Redepenning after Gieseler's death in 1854. 5 vols. N. Y., 1876-1880.

A very learned and most valuable work for the scholar. The text is brief, concise, clear and accurate. The larger part of each page is filled with notes and references, with long and important extracts from the sources which are not translated. The work is a library in itself.

Milman, Dean H. H.—(a) History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire (about 400 A.D). 3 vols. (sometimes bound in two). New and revised edition. N. Y., 1871.

Milman, Dean H. H.—(b) History of Latin Christianity to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. (1454 A.D.). New edition, 9 vols. Lond., 1883.

These two works form a complete and connected history, though the first is somewhat inferior to the second. His work on the Middle Ages is one of the most valuable in history, though lacking the results of modern scholarship. Yet it ranks next to Gibbon as a classic on the period, and is especially valuable on the Papacy, Monasticism and topics connected with literature and art. His treatment is impartial yet sympathetic, scholarly, and has a graceful, brilliant, literary style.

Gibbon, E.—The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, to 1461 A.D. Best edition by J. B. Bury. 7 vols.

Lond., 1896. Called the greatest historical work ever produced. It was written in 1766-1788. Indispensable for a study of early and mediæval history. Bury's notes are valuable additions, and correct misstatements by the results of the latest scholarship. An unrivalled authority.

Schaff, Philip.—History of the Christian Church. To the end of the Swiss Reformation, including Calvin. 7 vols. N. Y.

Latest and most valuable history of the Church. The first volume contains a valuable essay on Church History, with a full, critical and descriptive account of the literature on the subject. (Cf. three introductory lectures in Stanley's History of the Eastern Church; Bunsen's God in History; and for later views and literature, Flick's The Rise of the Mediæval Church, Chapters I and II.) His work excels in general arrangement, grouping and proportionate use of historical material, and is pervaded by a high literary and religious spirit. Each section or group of sections begins with a list of special literature on the subject, generally with a note indicating the character or value of each. Schaff is an impartial, broad-minded, conscientious scholar. His work is based upon an independent use of the sources. He shows wide reading of the latest English and American, as well as French and German, writers. His work ceased with his death in 1893. Vol. V, on the period just preceding the Reformation, is by his son, David S. Schaff.

Robertson, Canon J. C.—History of the Christian Church, to 1517 A.D. 8 vols. Revised edition. Lond., 1874. A scholarly work from the sources in a moderate and candid spirit. Not profound nor technical but popular, reliable and helpful.

Sheldon, H. C.—History of the Christian Church. 5 vols. N. Y., 1894. By a professor in the Boston University. Methodist.

Hurst, J. P.—History of the Christian Church. 2 vols. N. Y., 1897. Methodist.

Newman, A. H.—Manual of Church History. 2 vols. Phil., 1900. Baptist.

These are three of the latest general histories written from a denominational standpoint, but with profound modern

critical scholarship, in a broad and liberal spirit and with continual use of, and reference to, the latest literature on the subject. The biographical notes and introductory lecture on Church History in Hurst are particularly valuable.

Fisher, G. P.—History of the Christian Church. 1 vol., N. Y., 1887. Written by a Congregationalist and therefore, like the preceding, lacking in adequate treatment of the early organization of the Church; yet it is one of the best brief histories; written in the author's well-known scholarly and historical spirit. Readable and comprehensive. Maps and an appendix on the literature of the subject, with comments, add much to its value.

Gardner, Wm. E.—History of Christianity for Sunday Schools. N. Y., 1902. Excellent little manual.

Jennings, A. C.—Manual of Church History. 2 vols. N. Y., 1887-1888. By an English Churchman. Compact, useful and comprehensive, but unfortunate in following the arrangement by centuries.

Alzog, J.—Manual of Universal Church History. Trans. 3 vols. Cincinnati, 1874-1878. One of the best and most useful of the Roman Catholic works on general Church history. Alzog held a high place as a scholar and a Churchman. The work is liberal in tone and remarkably free from prejudice, and shows the Roman Catholic point of view in the most favorable light. The translation is from the 9th German edition (a 10th appeared in 1882), but the translators have made a number of changes, omissions and additions in an ultramontane spirit.

Kurtz, J. H.—Church History. Translation from the 9th and 10th German editions. 3 vols. N. Y., 1890. Most admirably arranged for a textbook and has been widely used as such in both languages. Full and comprehensive treatment, scholarly and devout. His Lutheran prejudice is seen in his treatment of the Organization, Sacraments and Papacy, but his book is exceedingly useful for concise reference.

Moeller, Wilhelm.— History of the Christian Church. Trans. 3 vols. N. Y., 1892. This is the latest and best of the German textbooks accessible to the English reader, embody-

ing the results of the latest scholarship in an admirable arrangement. The translation is not particularly well done, and since it appeared a new edition in the German, revised by Hans von Schubert, is of much greater value, both by arrangement and by scholarship.

Cheetham and Hardwick.—A History of the Christian Church. 4 vols. Lond., 1877-1907. The well known and highly prized works of Hardwick on the Middle Ages and the Reformation have been supplemented by Canon Cheetham with a volume on the Church history of the first six centuries, and another on the history since the Reformation to the present time. Making a complete and exceedingly valuable history of the Church in four volumes. The method is most helpful; the material comprehensive and well arranged, clearly and logically presented, with very full notes and references to the sources and latest authorities. The most serviceable, reliable and complete of the shorter histories.

Schubert, Hans von.—Outlines of Church History. Trans. N. Y., 1907. A valuable book by the learned editor of Moeller's Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.

Robertson, J. M.—Short History of Christianity. Lond., 1902. A sociological interpretation. Critical and rationalistic.

Crooks, G. R.—Story of the Christian Church. N. Y., 1897. By a professor in the Drew Theological Seminary. Methodist.

Zenos, A. C.—Compendium of Church History. Phil., 1906. Congregationalist professor in Hartford Theological Seminary.

Brueck, H.—History of the Catholic Church. Trans. 2 vols., 2nd ed. N. Y., 1889.

Gilmartin, T.—Manual of Church History. 2 vols. Dublin, 1892. Vol. I, 2nd ed., 1893.

Birkhäuser, J. A.—History of the Church. 7th ed. N. Y., 1903.

Funk, F. X.—Manual of Church History. Trans. Lond., 1910.

The last four are recent Roman Catholic Manuals of Church History, of which that of Prof. Funk of Tubingen is the latest and best.

Ten Epochs of Church History.—Edited by John Fulton. 10 vols. N. Y., 1896-1899.

The Church Universal.—Edited by W. H. Hutton. To be completed in 8 vols. N. Y., 1905 ff.

Epochs of Church History.—Edited by Mandell Creighton. N. Y., 1888 ff.

The Church, Past and Present.—Edited by H. M. Gwatkin. N. Y., 1900 ff.

The last four are series of books which aim to cover the general history of the Church. Many of the volumes are of special value. The first two series are the most complete.

This list would not be complete without two books which might well serve as companions to any of the above, and which have a distinct and special value of their own:

Allen, A. V. G.—The Continuity of Christian Thought. Boston, 1884. This work gives in a single volume a most suggestive and thoughtful outline and interpretation of the theology of the Church in its greatest men, institutions and phases, throughout the whole course of Church history.

Sohm, Rudolf.—Outlines of Church History. Trans. N. Y., 1904. This is a remarkably clear and able presentation of the whole life and development of the Church in its largest aspect and in its widest and most essential relations. It gives the pith and meaning of the Church's history and is the best philosophy of Church history yet written. Admirable for review, but necessitates a previous knowledge of the subject.

IV. Special Histories Dealing with the Early Periods of Church History

Adeney, W. F.—The Greek and the Eastern Churches. N. Y., 1908.

Backhouse, E., and Tylor, C.—Early Church History to Death of Constantine. 3d ed. Lond., 1892.

—Witnesses for Christ, 4th to 13th Century.—Sequel to the above by an English Quaker. 2 vols. Lond., 1887. Valua-

ble illustrations and extracts. Interesting on account of the point of view.

Bartlett, J. V.—Early Church History. The first four centuries. Lond., 1899.

Bartlett, J. V.—The Apostolic Age. N. Y., 1899.

Bate, H. N.—History of the Church to A.D. 325. Oxford Church Textbooks. N. Y., 1908. Brief and scholarly.

Baur, F. C.—The Church History of the First Three Centuries. Trans. 2 vols. Lond., 1878. Theological Trans. Fund Lib. This is the first part (all that was translated) of the author's larger work in five volumes. It is a work of profound scholarship and brilliant suggestion, but in spite of his keen insight and great learning, which have rendered much service to later students, his conclusions, owing to preconceived theories, have not been sustained by the investigations which his labors have stimulated.

Bigg, Charles.—Origins of Christianity, to the Time of Constantine. Oxford, 1909.

Bright, Wm.—A collection of works on early Church history:

(a) Waymarks in Church History. Lond., 1894.

(b) The Roman See in the Early Church. Lond., 1898.

(c) Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life. Lond., 1898.

(d) Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers: Athanasius, Chrysostom and Augustine. Lond., 1890.

(e) History of the Church from Milan to Chalcedon. 313 A.D. to 451 A.D. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1869.

(f) The Age of the Fathers. 2 vols. Lond., 1903. This is also a history from 313 A.D. to 451 A.D., but the treatment is different. More popular, but shows later scholarship.

(g) Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils. Lond., 1882.

Burkitt, F. C.—Early Christianity Outside of the Roman Empire. Camb., 1899.

Cheetham, S.—History of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries. Lond., 1905. The most comprehensive and complete recent single volume on the period.

Croke, A. D.—History of the Church under the Roman Empire (to 476). Lond., 1873.

Von Döllinger, J. J. T.—Manual of Church History. Trans. 4 vols. Lond., 1842.

Duchesne. L.—Early History of the Christian Church to the End of the Third Century. Trans. from the 4th ed. N. Y., 1909. An exceedingly valuable presentation of the subject by a liberal and learned French Roman Catholic. One of the latest and best authorities on the subject. The French work is in three volumes and extends to the end of the fifth century.

Durell, J. C. V.—The Historic Church. Camb., 1906. Based on a careful study of the Early Fathers.

Eusebius.—Ecclesiastical History. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers; First Series, Vol. I. Trans. and ed. by A. McGiffert. N. Y., 1890. The earliest history and most important source of the history of the first three centuries. The notes, with copious references and extracts, cover the whole range of the study of early Church history up to the time the work was published. Scholarly, critical and reverent, making this one of the most valuable works on the history of the first three centuries.

Fisher, G. P.—Beginnings of Christianity. N. Y., 1888.

Flick, A. C.—The Rise of the Mediæval Church, to the Thirteenth Century. N. Y., 1909. A valuable contribution. While not a comprehensive history of the Church, each chapter on a special and important topic is accompanied by a full list of the sources, special works and references by pages to all the principal general works. The first two chapters on the study of Church history, and a general bibliography on Church history are of special interest and value.

Greenwood.—Cathedra Petri. A Political History of the Latin Patriarchate. 6 vols. Lond., 1859-72. Valuable.

Gregorovius, F.—History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages. Trans. 8 vols. Lond., 1894.

Gurney, T. A.—The Church of the First Three Centuries. Lond., 1911.

Gwatkin, H. M.—Early Church History to 313 A.D. 2 vols. Lond., 1909. Suggestive, interesting and instructive. More for the general reader than for the special student.

Harnack, A.—The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Trans. 2 vols. 2nd ed. enlarged, with maps. N. Y., 1904. Vols. XIX, XX Theol. Trans. Library.

Harnack, A.—The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries. Trans. N. Y., 1910. Vol. XXXI Crown Theol. Library.

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. Trans. 7 vols. N. Y., 1894-1899. Vols. II, VII–XII Theol. Trans. Library.

Hefele, C. J. A.—History of the Christian Councils to 787 A.D. 5 vols. Edinb., 1894–1896.

Jackson, F. J. Foakes.—The History of the Christian Church to the Death of St. Leo The Great, 461 A.D. 5th ed. Camb., 1909. An able and scholarly presentation in the light of the most recent investigations, with full reference to all the authorities and best literature on every part of the subject. Its very full synopsis of contents reads like a history in epitome. The history is treated under twenty main subjects, so that the chronological divisions often overlap, and there is some repetition.

Kelly, H. H.—History of the Church of Christ to 430 A.D. 2 vols. Lond., 1901-1902. A convenient, well-written and scholarly manual by an English Churchman, director of the Society of the Sacred Mission.

Mahan, M.—Church History of the First Seven Centuries to the Close of the Sixth Council. N. Y., 1872.

Moxom, P. S.—From Jerusalem to Nicæa. Lowell Lectures. Boston, 1895.

Maurice, J. F. D.—Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries. Camb., 1854.

Neander, A.—Planting and Training of the Christian Church, and Antignostikus, or the Spirit of Tertullian. Trans. 2 vols. N. Y., 1856. Still of great value.

Pfleiderer, O.—Primitive Christianity. Trans. 4 vols. N. Y.

Pfleiderer, O.—Christian Origins. N. Y., 1906. Scholarly, critical and suggestive studies in early Church history.

Pressensé, E. de.—Early Years of Christianity. Trans. 5th ed. 4 vols. Lond., 1888-1889. A well-known, conservative French scholar.

Rainy, R.—The Ancient Catholic Church. 98 A.D. to 441 A.D. N. Y., 1902. International Theological Library. Scholarly treatment with valuable bibliography and references to the latest literature.

Ramsay, W. M.—The Church in the Roman Empire to 917 A.D. N. Y., 1893. Valuable for discussion of the persecutions and Church in Asia Minor.

Ramsay, W. M.—St. Luke, the Physician. Lond., 1908.

Renan, E.—Origins of Christianity. 7 vols. Lond., 1888. Brilliant, scholarly and suggestive; particularly the last volume on Marcus Aurelius.

Shahan, T. J.—The Beginnings of Christianity. N. Y., 1903. An interesting and valuable study by a Roman Catholic scholar.

Spence, H. D. M.—Early Christianity and Paganism. N. Y., 1902.

Westcott, B. F.—The Two Empires. Lond., 1909. The latest historical work by this great English scholar.

Wordsworth, Charles.—Church History to 451 A. D. 4 vols.

V. Works on the Fathers and Early Christian Literature

A. *Translations, Editions and Extracts*

Stearns, W. N.—Manual of Patrology. N. Y., 1899. Valuable for reference as a handbook or tabular view.

Lightfoot, J. B.—Apostolic Fathers. 6 vols. Lond., 1890. Best complete edition, with notes and translations.

Lightfoot, J. B.—Apostolic Fathers. 1 vol. Lond., 1893. Abbreviated edition of the larger work.

Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.—Three series, 10, 14, and 14 vols. respectively, ed. by Coxe, Schaff and Wace. N. Y., 1890-1894. Best American edition of translations of the works of the Early Fathers, with notes. The last volume contains the Canons of the Seven Ecumenical Councils.

Bohn Libraries of Ecclesiastical Authors. 15 vols. Lond., 1851 ff.

Migne, J. P.—Patrologia. Paris, 1844-1866. 222 vols. of Latin Fathers. 166 vols. of Greek Fathers. Most complete accessible texts of Early Fathers.

Cambridge Patristic Texts. Camb., 1899 ff.

Douglass Series of Greek and Latin Writers. Manuals of Texts, with notes on selected works. N. Y., 1877 ff.

Routh, M. J.—Reliquiæ Sacræ. 2nd ed. 5 vols. Oxford, 1846-1848. Texts of valuable fragments and remains.

Source Books of especially selected important passages and documents for historic illustration:

(a) Gwatkin, H. M.—Selections from early writers illustrative of Church history to the time of Constantine. Lond., 1897. Valuable introductory notes with original texts and translations. Very important.

(b) Henderson, E. F.—Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages. N. Y., 1892.

(c) Haddan and Stubbs.—Councils and Documents for English History.

(d) Ogg, F. A.—Source Book of Mediæval History. N. Y., 1908.

(e) Reich, E.—Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History. Lond., 1905.

(f) Robinson, J. H.—Readings in European History. Boston, 1906.

(g) Thatcher and McNeal.—Source Book for Mediæval History. N. Y., 1907.

(h) University of Pennsylvania translations and reprints of Original Sources of European History. Phil., 1894 ff.

Editions of select writings, or of single writers:

Octavius of Minucius Felix.—H. A. Holden. Oxford, 1863.
Origen, Apology.—John Patrick. Edinb., 1812.
Tertullian.—G. Currey. Camb., 1880.
Tertullian.—Brindley. Oxford, 1888.
Apostolic Canons.—Translated R. C. Jenkins. Lond., 1856.
Apology and Acts of Apollonius and other Monuments of Early Christianity.—F. C. Conybeare. N. Y., 1894.
Jewish and Heathen Testimonials.— Lardner, N. In his works, Vols. VI and VII. 10 vols. Lond., 1838.
Athanasius, Historical Writings.—W. Bright. Oxford, 1881.
Dionysius of Alexandria.—C. L. Felton. Camb., 1904.
Gregory of Nazianzus, Five Orations.—Edited by A. J. Mason. Camb., 1899.

B. *Sketches and Histories*

Crutwell, C. T.—Literary History of Early Christianity. 2 vols. Lond., 1893.

Donaldson, James—Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine to the Nicene Council. 3 vols. Lond., 1864-1866.

Kruger, G.—History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries. Trans. N. Y., 1897.

Early Christian Literature Primers.—Edited by G. P. Fisher. N. Y., 1874 ff.

Fathers for English Readers.—Edited by H. S. Holland. Lond., 1878 ff.

Hort, F. J. A.—Ante-Nicene Fathers. Six Lectures. Lond., 1895.

Lightfoot, J. B.—Essays on Supernatural Religion.

Bigg, Charles.—Christian Platonists of Alexandria. Oxford, 1886.

Benson, E. W.—Cyprian, His Life, His Times, His Works. Lond., 1897.

Bright, Wm.—Three Great Fathers: Athanasius, Chrysostom and Augustine. Lond., 1890.

Schaff, P.—St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine.

Giles, J. A.—Apostolic Records of Early Christianity. Lond., 1886.

Orr, J.—Early Christian History and Literature. N. Y., 1901.

Ropes, J. H.—Apostolic Age in Light of Modern Criticism. N. Y., 1906.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, C. K.—Manual of Historical Literature. Third Edition. N. Y., 1889.

Fisher, J. A.—Select Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History. Boston, 1885.

Dowling, J. G.—Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History. Lond., 1838.

Lownde, W. T.—The British Librarian. Lond., 1839-1842.

Good bibliographies may be found in the following works on Church history:

Fisher, G. P.—History of the Christian Church. N. Y., 1892. Appendix III. Notes on the literature of Church history to 1887.

Schaff, Philip.—Good bibliographies at the beginning of each chapter as well as at the beginning of the whole work. Also in Moeller and Hurst. Also at the end of articles in the various encyclopædias and dictionaries. The best, most recent, detailed and complete bibliography is given in Flick's Rise of the Mediæval Church. N. Y., 1909. Lists in the second chapter and at the end of each succeeding chapter.

Necessarily bibliographies are constantly changing as the old gives place to the new, and they also vary with the point of view of the reader. Thus the older general histories are being replaced by the scholarly monographs and treatment of short periods by specialists. It is one of the objects of this Manual to call attention to the latest and most important of them.

A. FIRST PERIOD

THE APOSTOLIC AND THE EARLY CHURCH. FROM THE BIRTH OF OUR LORD TO THE EDICT OF MILAN.

4 B.C. TO 313 A.D.

MANUAL OF EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

A. CHAPTER I.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

4 B.C. TO 98 A.D.

§1. Introductory. Preparation for Christianity

CHURCH History is the history of all that concerns the Kingdom of God as founded on earth by Jesus Christ. It describes the origin and development of the organization and communities of those who profess and call themselves Christians, including the various activities, forms, methods and manifestations of the Christian life and all that affects it internally and externally. The object and purpose of the Church is to realize in itself the life of Christ, to maintain His truth, and to bring the world through obedience into a living spiritual union with Him. The effort to realize this threefold object gives us the material of Church History.

Church History has been divided into an Early, a Mediæval and a Modern period; but the limits of these periods have been variously fixed, though the year 1517 has been accepted quite generally as marking the

boundary line between the Mediæval and the Modern. For the present purpose the year 476 is taken as marking the boundary between the early and the mediæval period. This early period may be divided into two shorter periods: the first, down to 313 A.D., when Christianity was in its formative organizing period under the strain of frequent persecution and repression by the Roman Empire; and the second, from 313 A.D. to 476 A.D., when as a recognized, and finally as the established religion of the Empire it was formulating its faith in the first four General Councils, extending its influence, developing its organization and laying the foundations of its great institution in the West which had its head and centre at Rome and occupied the vacant throne of the Cæsars — the Papacy. These periods are still further subdivided, as may be seen in the analytical outline.

The birth of Jesus is, from any point of view, the central point in the world's history. All events and the whole progress of mankind, before that fact, look toward it; and all events in the civilized world since then, are colored, influenced and shaped by it, and are judged and valued by the standards which it has set up and established. The form of chronology as received by the whole civilized world bears witness to this statement, inasmuch as only two divisions of time are known: Before Christ and Anno Domini. The motto of history is the declaration of the Apostle to the Galatians: "When the fulness of the time came,

God sent forth His Son." Hence all history before Christ is the preparation for His coming.

(1) In the East. Negatively, here as well as in Greece and Rome, the old religions had proved their unfitness and inability to satisfy the spiritual needs of man, and had fallen into either dreary scepticism or wild superstition, and men were vainly struggling and aspiring after something better than they knew. Consciously and unconsciously they were seeking after God, and their condition and experience were well interpreted and met by St. Paul in his presentation of Christ to the Athenians by the revelation of "the Unknown God." In the decay of the religions of Greece and Rome, the legends and mysteries of Phrygia, Egypt, Syria and Persia held out attractive hopes and visions to the souls of men. Cybele, Attis, Isis, Serapis, the Baals and Mithras were idealized and worshipped. The propagation of these oriental cults levelled the road for Christianity and heralded its triumph. Stoicism and Neo-Platonism sought to revive the embers of ethical aspiration and conduct, but without avail. Neither nature nor the nature-gods, nor philosophers and rhetoricians were able to provide adequate and satisfactory forms and objects of worship, of inspiration and of enthusiasm for life. The high ideal of harmony, the sense of peace and reconciliation were wanting, not solely on account of a deep conviction of sin, but of need and want, of something lacking and unrealized, expressed and deepened by the sense of sin.

(2) There was a positive preparation in Greece. Her art and her philosophy expressed and developed beauty, freedom, truth and the power of the human mind; while her language, the most beautiful, flexible and capable of expressing clearly the highest thought which the world has ever known, was ready for the composition of Gospel, Epistle, Sermon, Exposition, Creed and Liturgy of the Christian Faith.

Rome also prepared literally the way for Christ. Law and order, well-made roads in every direction, the imperial organization and unity, strong administration and universal peace, the wonderful language, unified and made possible communication and the transmission of the Gospel through the newly found Western world.

The preparation is seen also in the German tribes of the far north; the new world for the new religion; to be conquered by Christianity, converted to Christ, civilized and Christianized. Long before the fall of Rome was thought or dreamed of, those wild barbarian tribes were coming into being, approaching and entering into combination with each other, and then moving, slowly at first but ever faster and faster, now eastward, then westward, but always southward; nearer and nearer to the great Roman Empire which stood like an enormous storehouse filled with all the treasures of the past. Behind these northern tribes pressed on the still mightier, more barbarous and fiercer horde of the Huns, driving before them Visigoths and Ostrogoths, Vandals and Lombards,

Franks and Burgundians, till at last they burst the boundaries and plunged into the Empire, ready to receive the life and treasure she was about to yield up, but a life and treasure already transformed by Christianity and which they in turn would transmit to all the world.

(3) The preparation in Judaism was the most direct. The whole Old Testament and the history of the people of Israel are the record of it. The condition of the nation in the time of Christ is the evident realization of the Apostolic declaration. The revelation of God, the covenant of righteousness, the Messianic hope, the symbolism of its institutions and religious forms and sacrifices, the reigns of its kings, the services of its priests and the declarations of its prophets all point to Jesus Christ and their fulfillment in Him. Law and prophecy, revelation and history find in Him their perfect expression and realization.

(4) The Roman Empire extended from the Euphrates to the Atlantic and from the African desert to the Danube, Rhine and Weser, with a population of about 100,000,000. The rest of the world was little known and had no influence in the West. It was governed in Rome by the Emperor with the nominal concurrence of the Senate, and in the provinces by governors appointed by the Emperor in the new provinces and appointed by the Senate in the older ones. It was a monarchical rule under the old republican forms. It was made up of many peoples inter-

mingled; of different races, languages and religions. Latins and latinized peoples predominated in the west, the military and governing classes being Romans; Greeks predominated in Greece, Asia Minor and Egypt and the coasts of the Mediterranean; Jews were mostly in Palestine and scattered through the cities of the empire engaged in commerce; Syrians, Arabians, Phœnicians and other native populations, Celts, Copts and Berbers, in their own homes, with a fringe of peoples still barbarous and unsubdued. Persians, Parthians and Scythians were on the east, desert tribes in the south, and the various Teutonic tribes in the north.

The influences of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria had come to an end. Persia had affected the Empire very little, India and China not at all. The golden age of Greece had passed; but her influence was still felt in all that made for culture in art, sculpture, architecture, poetry, drama, oratory, history, philosophy and religion; and her language remained the language of culture and commerce.

The influence of the Jews was felt in commerce as well as in morals and religion. All religions were national, and, except Judaism, had no connection with morals, ethics being a department of philosophy. The moral and physical condition was rapidly degenerating. Politics were debased by graft, oppression and favoritism. Family life was disintegrating, slavery demoralizing, and amusements degrading society and the State. Industry flourished, the com-

merce was enormous, and wealth fairly poured in. Travel and education spread intelligence and culture.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Bruce, A. B.—Apologetics. pp. 165-336. 7th ed. N. Y., 1904.

Breed, D. R.—A History of the Preparation of the World for Christ. N. Y., 1803.

Davidson, W. L.—The Stoic Creed. 1907.

Döllinger, J. J. I.—The Gentile and the Jew. 2 vols. Lond., 1862.

Fisher, G. P.—Beginnings of Christianity. N. Y., 1877.

Hardwick, C.—Christ and Other Masters. Lond., 1875.

Hausrath, A.—History of the New Testament Times. 6 vols. Lond., 1895.

Lux Mundi. Essays by Gore and others.—IV. Preparation of the World for Christ.

Maurice, F. D.—Religions of the World. Lond. and Boston, 1880.

Pfleiderer, O.—Philosophy of Religion. Trans. 4 vols. Lond., 1888. Vols. III and IV.

Uhlhorn, G.—Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. Lond., 1880.

Wernle, P.—The Beginnings of Christianity. 2 vols. Lond., 1908.

Graetz, H.—History of the Jews. 5 vols. Lond, 1892.

Toy, C. H.—Judaism and Christianity.

Schürer, E.—Jewish People in the Time of Christ. Trans. 5 vols. Edinb., 1900.

Bigg, Charles.—The Church's Task under the Roman Empire. Oxford, 1905.

Fowler, W. W.—The Religious Experience of the Roman People. Lond., 1911.

Cumont, Franz.—The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. Chicago, 1911. A brief, scholarly treatment of this most important subject. After reading this work one does not wonder at the success of Christianity in that period.

§2. Jesus Christ, and the Origins of Christianity

This forms a subject by itself, and its consideration belongs to Church History only so far as Christ's words and deeds are concerned with the founding, or preparation for the founding, of His Church. The birth of Jesus is the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the Church is the pledge of this fact and the agent of its realization in humanity. The Resurrection is its justification and the Ascension is the inspiration of the Church's activity.

The word Church occurs only twice in the Gospels. Once in that significant passage, "On this rock I will build my Church" (St. Matt. xvi: 18), and again in St. Matt. xviii: 17.

Jesus speaks of His Kingdom more than one hundred times in His parables and in His direct teaching. Sometimes the phrase refers to the general governance of God, sometimes to the heavenly state or the ideal realized and fulfilled, but sometimes it is best interpreted by an earthly society, an organic Kingdom of which Jesus is the Head and King. His acts, however, here as in other respects, speak louder and clearer than His words.

First, His choice and commission of "The Twelve," and His constant and intimate association with them for instruction, counsel, inspiration and the conferring of special power and authority upon them. (St. Matt. x: esp. 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 27, 40;

xxvi: 20; xxviii: 16-20. St. Mark iii: 14-19; xiv: 17; xvi: 14-20. St. Luke vi: 13-16; xxii: 14.)

Secondly, His choice of "The Seventy," for a preparatory and assistant ministry. (St. Luke x: 1-20. Cf. St. Matt. x: 9-16.)

Thirdly, He ordained the continual observance of the two great sacraments: Baptism and the Eucharist or Lord's Supper. He supplied the fundamental ideas of Christianity: the Universal Fatherhood of God, His own Divine Sonship, the Eternal Presence and Power of the Holy Spirit, the Brotherhood of Man, and the Law of Love and Self-sacrifice.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

The Lives of Christ

Fairbairn, A. M.—Studies in the Life of Christ. Most suggestive and interpretative.

Farrar, F. W.—Life of Christ.

Geikie, C.—Life and Words of Christ.

Neander, A.—Life of Christ. Much used by later writers.

Edersheim.—Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Very scholarly.

Butler, A. A.—How to Study the Life of Christ. Admirable.

Seeley, J. R.—Ecce Homo. Lond., 1867. A study in the humanity of Jesus. Powerful.

Stevens and Burton.—A Harmony of the Gospels.

Weiss, B.—Life of Christ. 3 vols. Edinb., 1890.

Keim, T.—Jesus of Nazara. 6 vols. Lond., 1876.

Gilbert.—Early Interpreters of Jesus.

§3. The Church in Jerusalem

The Book of the Acts of the Apostles, so called, is the first history of the Christian Church. Only in a general way is it really an account of the Apostles. It is rather the account of St. Peter and St. Paul and those associated with them in this work. Accordingly it is in this book that we find the first history of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Taken in connection with the Epistles, which were written in the time of which it treats, we have all the direct evidence of the history of the Church down to the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Apostolic Age.

The first act was to complete the number twelve by supplying the vacant place left by Judas. This literalness was not kept up, however, and many bore the name of Apostle who were not of the twelve.

On the day of Pentecost, while the Apostles were together in Jerusalem awaiting the fulfillment of the promise, a special presence and power of the Holy Spirit came to them. The preaching of St. Peter won thousands who received baptism, and the mission of the Christian Church on earth dates from that day. (Acts ii: 1-41.)

By the preaching of the Apostles the Church grew daily in Jerusalem and was composed entirely of Jews. At first there was no separation from Judaism. The Temple services were attended, and the followers of Jesus appeared as a band or group of devoted Jews

distinguished from others by believing that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah and being baptized in that faith, continuing in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and prayers. (Acts ii: 41, 42. Cf. St. Luke xxiv: 35.)

The Church in Jerusalem included in its membership both Hebrews and Hellenists (Greek-speaking Jews). The general distribution of the common fund (Acts ii: 44, 45) became an important function, and on account of the complaints of the Hellenists that the Hebrews were getting more than their share in the daily distribution, the Twelve called the disciples together and asked them to choose seven men to give special attention to this work. "The Seven" were accordingly chosen, whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands upon them. (Acts vi: 1-6.) This is generally taken to be the origin of the Diaconate or of a subordinate ministry, although the name Deacon is not used, nor the functions of the "Seven" definitely fixed. Stephen, one of the "Seven," probably a Hellenist, gives the first sign of breaking away from the strict Mosaic law. The Jews understood him to say, as they testified, that "this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." (Acts vi: 14.) He became the first martyr. This was the beginning of a severe persecution by the Jews which scattered the disciples far and wide.

Philip, another of the "Seven," his special work

being taken from him, went to Samaria and there preached the Word. The Gospel was called "The Word" and Christianity "The Way." (Cf. Acts ix: 2.) Those who accepted and believed were baptized only into the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts viii: 12), but the Twelve at Jerusalem sent St. Peter and St. John who laid their hands upon them and they received the Holy Spirit. (Acts viii: 17.)

Thus Baptism and Confirmation found their true place in the Church. The experience with Simon Magus, who was baptized and continued with Philip in his preaching, and when he saw the gift of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation, tried to purchase from the Apostles the power of conferring it, is interesting because it has given his name, Simony, to the procuring of ecclesiastical positions by purchase; and he is regarded as the first of the Gnostics.

Already a step was taken to carry the gospel outside of the strict limits of Judaism, for the Samaritans were despised by the Jews (St. John iv: 9), and the Ethiopian eunuch whom Philip baptized was only a proselyte. But a much more decided step was taken when St. Peter saw the vision of the sheet and baptized the Roman centurion Cornelius. (Acts x.)

At the same time the Church was spreading elsewhere. Others of the "Seven," and disciples driven out by the persecution about Stephen, travelled through Cyprus and Syria into Asia Minor preaching the Gospel, though only to the Jews. But some of those who had been made disciples in Cyprus and

Cyrene went to Antioch (in Syria) and there preached to the Greeks also, so that many were converted. When the Twelve heard of it they sent Barnabas, himself a native of Cyprus, to investigate and report. He rejoiced greatly and exhorted them to persevere, and immediately went to Tarsus to seek Saul, one of the most remarkable converts to Christianity. Barnabas took him to Antioch and began the great work of Gentile Christianity. The name "Christians" was given to the disciples first at Antioch, and with the new name began a new mission and a new future for the Church with Antioch as a new centre, and Saul, who is afterwards known as Paul, as the head and prime mover in the work. There was misunderstanding and some opposition at the outset, however, which resulted in a great conference at Jerusalem, sometimes called the "First General Council of the Church," which met to settle the relation of the Gentiles to the old Mosaic law, and the claims of the Church. The year 50 A.D. has been regarded generally as the date of this conference, but the latest study of recent scholars is inclined to an earlier date, perhaps as early as 45 or 46 A.D. The account preserved to us in Acts xv gives a glimpse of ecclesiastical organization and procedure which is interesting and helpful. Paul and Barnabas with others were appointed by the Church at Antioch to go up to Jerusalem to consult the Apostles and the Elders. The Apostles and Elders were gathered to consider the matter. After a full and free discussion, Peter

gave an address rehearsing his own case and the case of Cornelius. Then Paul and Barnabas told what they had seen and done among the Gentiles. After all had finished speaking James arose and gave his "judgment," not to trouble them that among the Gentiles turn to God; circumcision and ceremonies of the Mosaic law were not to be required. "Thus it seemed good to the Apostles and the Elders with the whole Church to choose men out of their company and send them with Paul and the others to Antioch to carry out this decision." They chose Judas Barsabas and Silas, "chief men" among the brethren. The letter which they were to carry, began thus: "The Apostles and the Elders, Brethren, unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles. . . . It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." We are not concerned just now with the contents of this letter but rather with its form and what it implies. It was undoubtedly intended to be final and conclusive, as the language indicates, and issued with all the authority of the Church and Elders and Apostles, with James "the brother of the Lord" at their head, in the mother Church of Jerusalem. It was discovered, however, that it left many details unsettled; back of all was still felt the old spirit of Jewish prejudice and exclusiveness which would not down at the bidding even of "James and the Apostles and Elders." The most striking references to it are in Galatians ii: 11-14, and in Acts xxi: 25.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

von Döbschutz, E.—Christian Life in the Primitive Church. Lond., 1904.

von Döbschutz, E.—The Apostolic Age. Trans. Boston. 1910.

Harnack, A.—Acts of the Apostles. N. Y., 1909.

Harnack, A.—Luke the Physician. N. Y., 1907. Crown Theol. Lib., Vols. XIX, XXVII.

McGiffert, A. C.—History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. N. Y., 1896.

von Weiszäcker, C.—The Apostolic Age. Trans. 2 vols. N. Y., 1896.

Bigg, Charles.—Origins of Christianity. Lond., 1909.

Pfleiderer, O.—Christian Origins. Trans. N. Y., 1906.

Harnack, A.—What is Christianity? 2nd ed. N. Y., 1901.

Shehan, T. J. (R. C.)—Beginnings of Christianity. N. Y., 1903.

Bruce, A. B.—Apologetics. pp. 336-465.

§4. St. Paul and the Gentile Church

Paul has been rightly called the second founder of the Gentile Church. His deep comprehensive grasp of the fundamental principles of Christianity, freed as far as possible from anything Jewish or provincial, and his keen insight into all that was permanent, justify the prominence given in the New Testament to his work and writings and declare him to be the chief of the Apostles in labor and accomplishment. He made three missionary journeys; and his work extended through Syria, Asia Minor, Cyprus, Crete, Macedonia and Greece, and, though not in the way he intended and expected, even to Italy and Rome

by way of Malta and Sicily. But his most important work lay in Asia Minor, and here the Christian Church had its earliest and most rapid development. The earliest indications of definite and complete organization are found here, the largest missionary activity proceeds from here, and here the earliest heretical tendencies are found.

In Rome the work of St. Paul reached its end, and the desire of the Apostle to preach the Gospel at Rome was accomplished. With this also the purpose of the Book of Acts is fulfilled, the bearing of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome. At this point the Book of Acts ends. Ancient tradition declares that St. Paul was released at the end of the two years, journeyed to Spain according to his intention expressed in Romans xv: 24, 28 (cf. Philemon 22; Phil. i: 25; ii: 24), and again to the far East, establishing Titus as the head of the Church in Crete, and Timothy in Ephesus. Then, returning to Rome, he was again imprisoned and put to death about 68 A.D.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Conybeare, W. J., and Howson, J. S.—Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

Lewin, T.—Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

Farrar, F. W.—Life and Works of St. Paul.

Means, Stewart.—St. Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church. Lond., 1903.

Lightfoot, J. B.—St. Paul and the Three (in Galatians, pp. 276-346). St. Paul and Seneca (in Philippians, pp. 268-326).

Weinel, Heinrichs.—St. Paul: The Man and His Work. N. Y., 1906.

§5. St. Peter and the Roman Church

It is not known who first preached Christianity at Rome. The constant stream of travellers, merchants and soldiers could not fail to bring the Gospel early to Rome as everything else was brought thither. (Acts xviii: 2 and Suetonius, Claudius 25, testify to the fact of Christianity in Rome, c. 50 or 52 A.D.) St. Paul wrote his Epistle to Roman Christians in 58, before he went there, and on his arrival found many to meet and welcome him. (Acts xxviii: 14-16.)

Not until after the second century do we find a clear and general tradition that St. Peter went to Rome. Not until the third century do the Bishops of Rome begin to put forward their claim to be his successors in the Roman bishopric. By both Clement and Ignatius his name is associated with St. Paul's in connection with Rome, and the term "Babylon" in I Peter v: 13 is now generally interpreted as Rome. It seems almost certain that he was not in Rome at the time of St. Paul's imprisonment there, for he is not mentioned in Acts nor in any of St. Paul's Epistles to or from Rome. Indeed St. Paul implies that when he wrote to the Romans no one Apostle was responsible for the Christian Church there. (Rom. xv: 20-24.)

Few and indefinite are the New Testament and early references to St. Peter. He was obliged by Herod's persecution, 44 A.D., to leave Jerusalem. (Acts xii: 1-3, 17.) He was present at the Council

and then went to Antioch. (Acts xv: 7, 35, 40. Gal. ii: 9, 11.) Tradition places him at Antioch as its Bishop before he went to Rome. His residence in Rome could not have been long, but it is probable that there he received the martyr's crown at the hands of the Emperor Nero. The legend of a twenty-five-years episcopate in Rome is not earlier than the fourth century and is inconsistent with all the known facts in the early history.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Robinson, C. S.—Simon Peter: His Life and Times. 2 vols. Lond., 1895.

Ryburg, A. V.—Roman Legends about the Apostles Paul and Peter. Lond., 1898.

Hatch, E.—"Peter." Encyclopædia Britannica. 9th ed. (See also the Ecclesiastical Dictionaries and Encyclopædias.)

Spence, H. D. M.—Early Christianity and Paganism. App. B., St. Peter at Rome. N. Y., 1902.

Flick, A. C.—The Rise of the Mediæval Church. (pp. 71-90.)

King, Francis.—The Primacy of Peter. Lond., 1907.

Krüger, H. G. E.—The Papacy. Trans. N. Y., 1909.

Allnatt, C. F. B.—Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome? Lond., 1903.

§6. St. James, St. John and the Other Apostles

We have trustworthy accounts of only the most distinguished of the other Apostles.

James, the brother of John, suffered a martyr's death in Jerusalem 44 A.D. There is only tradition to guide us regarding the life of St. John after he and St. Peter had laid their hands on the newly

baptized Christians in Samaria, converted by St. Philip, one of the "Seven." A very early and generally accepted tradition, first set forth in connection with the Easter Controversies in the middle of the second century by Polycarp of Smyrna (Eus., H. E., v: 24), declares that soon after the death of St. Paul, which removed his oversight at Ephesus, St. John settled there, and, except for the period of his exile to Patmos (exact date not known), remained there until his death about 98 A.D. This tradition has lately been called into question, however, on account of finding no evidence earlier than Irenæus, but the tradition through Polycarp and Irenæus seems strong enough to hold.

The traditions regarding the other Apostles and the composition of the Apostles' Creed are all so legendary that it is hard to pick out the kernel of reality. Ancient, at least according to Eusebius, are the traditions that St. Thomas preached in Parthia, St. Andrew in Scythia, and St. Bartholomew in India; though, in later traditions, St. Thomas appears as the Apostle of India. St. Mark, cousin of St. Barnabas, companion, first of St. Paul, then of St. Peter, and writer of the second gospel, on the basis of a tradition found at the end of the second century and quoted by Eusebius, was the founder and first bishop of the Church of Alexandria.

SPECIAL REFERENCE

Fouard, C.—St. John and the Closing of the Apostolic Age. N. Y., 1905.

§7. Worship and Organization

The Christian Church is essentially the creation of Jesus Christ. He supplied its fundamental ideas; gathered the first disciples, out of whom He chose twelve Apostles and seventy Evangelists, the first Christian ministry; ordained the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and taught and commissioned the twelve Apostles to continue His work. The earliest authoritative definition of the Church is found in Acts ii: 42: "The Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers."

According to its outward historical appearance, the Church comprised the acknowledged followers of Jesus Christ. For the purposes of legal existence, religious self-attestation and expression, and the achievement of its great end and mission in the world, it has developed forms of constitution and government, for the expression of religious and moral life, and for the regulation of doctrine and education.

From the very first, Baptism was the sacrament by which all were brought into union with Christ in the Church. Not only individuals but whole households were thus admitted. (Acts xvi: 15, 33. I Cor. i: 16.) It was followed by the laying on of hands that the baptized might "receive the Holy Ghost," the spiritual power of the Christian life.

The central service of the Christian Church was, from the beginning, the "Lord's Supper," or Eucharist, instituted by our Lord Himself at that last supper

with the Apostles with the command, "Do this in remembrance of Me." As at the institution, so afterward for a while it was celebrated after a solemn evening meal, called the Agape, on the first day of the week, the day when He first appeared to them alive after His crucifixion, and which, from that very day, has always been kept, as not only the celebration, but the witness and the pledge of His resurrection. (I Cor. x: 16-21; xi: 20-34; xvi: 2. Acts xx: 7.) Prayers and thanksgiving, exhortation, teaching and reading from the Old Testament and Apostolic letters, psalms, and hymns, with an offertory, formed the ordinary services. (I Cor. xvi: 2. Acts ii: 42; viii: 4; xi: 19. James iii. I Tim. ii. Col. iv: 16. Eph. v: 19. Col. iii: 16. Pliny, Epistles, x: 97.)

The separate assembling of the Christians appears from Acts ii: 40-47; I Cor. xi: 17-20; xiv: 26; Heb. x: 25. Among the Hebrew Christians, at first, these meetings were supplemental to the Temple or synagogue worship (Acts iii: 1, 11; xiv: 1; xvii: 2; xix: 8; xiii: 14-16), and sometimes were held in one of the halls of the Temple at Jerusalem. At a later period and among the Gentiles they were held in private houses or in rented halls. All these services were open to believers and unbelievers alike (I Cor. xiv: 16, 24), with a special place assigned to unbelievers (verse 16). But the celebration of the Lord's Supper was restricted to those who were in the full communion of the Church. (I Cor. v: 1-5,

9-11. I Tim. i: 20. Gal. i: 8, 9. II John, 10, 11. II Thess. iii: 14. Titus iii: 10. Rom. xvi: 17.)

Excommunication was practised, not for punishment, but for the preservation of the purity of the Church and the reformation of the offender. (Gal. vi: 1. II Cor. ii: 7, 8. I Cor. v: 5; xi: 32.) Confession and Holy Unction for the healing of the sick were recommended. (James v: 14, 16.) Ordination to office in the Church was performed by laying on of hands. (Acts viii: 17; vi: 6; xiii: 3. I Tim. iv: 14.)

As the New Testament presents us with all the material of our faith, the whole truth of Christianity, out of which and in conformity with which the faith of the Church has been formulated and embodied in a Creed, although the New Testment does not give us the formulated Creed; so it presents to us the facts and conditions on which the organization of the Church was based and out of which developed the Christian ministry in the three orders: Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, although it does not furnish a written constitution, nor the final and detailed form of that ministry. Jesus declared that He founded His Church upon the fact of the Incarnation and the acknowledgment of Himself as the Christ, the Son of God. (St. Matthew xvi: 16-18.) And St. Paul declared to the Ephesians (Eph. ii: 20) that it was "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." (Cf. I Peter ii: 4-8.) The Twelve Apostles were chosen out of the first members of the Church, among the earli-

est followers of Christ, to hold a special position and to exercise special functions in the Church. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit." (Cf. St. Matt. x: 1. St. Luke vii: 3.) The Seventy also were chosen for a special work, to prepare the way for His coming and to carry the blessings of the Gospel dispensation. (St. Luke x: 1-20.) Thus the Gospel record sets before us the threefold ministry: Jesus, The Twelve, The Seventy. In the Apostolic period we get a glimpse of the organization of the Church at Jerusalem in the Council of Jerusalem. (Acts xv: 2, 4, 13, 19, 22.) This was the central authoritative Church of the Apostolic period; and we note here the threefold ministry, St. James, the Apostles, the Elders. To complete the picture we shall find in the next period, in the Epistles of Ignatius, the organization of the Churches in Asia Minor at the beginning of the second century, i.e., the threefold ministry: The Bishop, the Presbyters, the Deacons (Ignatius Ep. to the Trallians, II). Ignatius deliberately declares this to be a copy of the Gospel and Jerusalem order, for the Bishop is in the place of Christ (we have been told that St. James held his place in the Church at Jerusalem because he was "the Lord's brother"), and the Presbyters in the place of the Apostles, while the Deacons are by Divine (that is later) command (perhaps to represent the Seventy, subordinate to the Twelve). Furthermore, in his letters addressed to various Churches in Asia, Ignatius urges them to

hold fast to their Bishop, the head of the local Church, in order to preserve unity and to keep out heresy. He speaks as if having in view the two aspects of the Church which we have already cited. Nor does he speak of the single Bishop as a new institution. He exhorts the Christians in the various Churches in Asia to reverence and uphold their Presbyters and Deacons as well as their Bishop. His cry is, "Rally around your spiritual Chiefs!" The fact that they form a threefold rather than a twofold order is of secondary importance to his argument; he treats that as a matter of fact, uncontested and traditional, and as though he had no need to urge its acceptance. This testimony to the existence of the single Bishop in so many Churches at such an early date is the very reason why these Epistles were so long viewed with suspicion in some quarters.

Toward the middle of the second century the monarchical Episcopate also comes before us in an undisputed tradition in the western communities of Rome, Lyons, Corinth, Athens and Crete as well as in more eastern localities. Nowhere is there a trace of any protest against a sudden revolution, any change transferring the government from a college of Bishops or Presbyters to a single head.

St. Paul divides the early ministry of the Church into two classes: the spiritual, missionary, or itinerant ministry, comprising Apostles, Prophets and Teachers; and the local, administrative officers. The first evidence of this distinction is seen in Acts vi,

where, under the direction of the twelve Apostles, the Seven are chosen to serve tables. Chrysostom sees in this account the origin of neither Deacons nor Presbyters specifically. (Hom. on Acts, xiv.) It was Cyprian of Carthage who fixed the traditional interpretation that it is the institution of the Diaconate. (Ep. 64: 3.) The names of the local officers are Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, according to the order in which we find them in Ignatius at the beginning of the second century; but there is much discussion and difference of opinion regarding the origin and application of these names in the New Testament, as they are used in both a general and technical sense. Bishops and Deacons are, however, usually associated together and it seems sometimes as if Presbyter was used in a general way as comprehending both. Following Jerome, it has been held by many that Presbyter and Bishop were interchangeable terms; but it is now held by the best scholars that although all Bishops might be Presbyters, not all Presbyters were Bishops.[1]

It is to be noted that in the New Testament and many early writers references to the local officers are made to them in the plural, and there are many theories to explain the method by which what is called the monarchical or single Episcopate was brought about. It is probable that the process

[1] McGiffert, p. 663 and note 1. Allen, Ch. Inst., pp. 79-80. Duchesne, pp. 69-70.

varied in different Churches according to the different times and conditions of each. It must have been very early; not only because all signs of the Collegiate Episcopate disappeared before the middle of the second century, but because of the necessities of the case and the tendency based upon early precedents. Jesus, Peter, James, and Paul, each occupied a single and unique relation to those with whom he associated. The general necessity of a single head or president is at once recognized. Even an ordinary committee has to have a chairman. Government cannot be carried on by commission. In the affairs of the Church the need would be even more apparent, in maintaining unity, in carrying on communication with other Churches, administering alms, and especially in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. One theory is that of localization of an Apostle or Prophet, or someone sent by an Apostle, as in Jerusalem, in Ephesus and in Crete; another theory is that of elevation out of the Presbyterate, as Lightfoot argues from appearances in Alexandria. The conclusion seems to be that the monarchical Episcopate, which was foreshadowed in the appointments made by Christ and realized in the constitution of the Church at Jerusalem and in Asia Minor, really existed from the first century, and only emerged into clearer and clearer light as the mists of the early obscurity cleared away. The latest researches are making this increasingly evident.

Surely the establishment of the genuineness of the

Greek recension of the Seven Epistles of Ignatius and their assignment to the early part of the second century (107-116), and the recent discovery of the Didache, taken with the evidence already on hand, confirm and justify the statement made in the Preface to the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church,—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Jacob, G. A.—Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament, 5th ed. N. Y., 1879.

Cotterill, H.—Genesis of the Church. Edinb., 1872.

Lightfoot, J. B.—The Christian Ministry. In "Philippians" and separately.

McIlhenney, John J.—Doctrine of the Church. Phila., 1879.

Hort, F. J. A.—The Christian Ecclesia. Lond., 1897.

Hatch, Edwin.—Organization of Early Christian Churches. Bampton Lectures, 1880.

Vos, Gerhardus.—The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom and the Church. N. Y., 1903.

Lowrie, Walter.—Church and Organization. pp. 9-30; 85-155; 271-312; 351-402.

Harnack, A.—Constitution and Law, etc. pp. 6-39.

Expositor, Third Series, Vol. V, January-June, 1887. Articles by Sanday, Harnack, Gore and others.

See also Bibliography in A II, §9, and A III, §7.

§8. The Spread of Christianity and Early Persecutions

During the first century Christianity spread silently and rapidly in the districts marked by the missionary activity of Paul and the other Apostles and Evangelists, into Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, North Africa, Egypt, Arabia, possibly also Spain in the west, and in the east toward Persia, Scythia and Armenia. It followed at first the track of the Jewish Dispersion and the chief commercial routes of the Empire; thus establishing itself in the principal cities and along the main highways of commerce and travel, with Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria and Rome as its great centres, and the seacoast towns of Palestine after the destruction of Jerusalem.

At first the Apostles, Prophets, Teachers and Evangelists were the appointed Apostolic missionaries; but every Christian was a missionary, and soldiers, sailors, merchants and travellers carried the Gospel as seeds are borne by every passing wind. Not without opposition, however. At first they were the object of suspicion and hatred by the Jews, whose attacks are recorded or implied in the Acts and other writings of the New Testament; they soon came under the notice of the Emperor, although at first regarded as a sect of the Jews. The earliest evidence of this, as of the existence of Christians in Rome, is found in the statement of Suetonius, that Claudius, 54 A.D., "expelled the Jews from Rome for

raising incessant tumults about Chrestus." (Cf. Acts xviii: 2.)

The next event was the massacre by Nero 64 A.D. The destruction of Jerusalem 70 A.D. under Vespasian made clear and final the separation of the Christians from the Jews, and deprived them of what little protection they might have had against the Empire, as a sect of the Jews.

The beginning of persecution was due to popular dislike based on the disturbance which Christianity caused in the existing relations of society, especially in the family, in amusements and in business, in which it displayed so much aggressiveness and intolerance. Interference with trade and family relations are noted as early as Acts xvi: 16-21; Acts xix: 19, 24-27; Eph. vi: 5-9; St. Matt. x: 34-37; I Cor. vii: 10-16; x: 24-32; I Tim. vi: 1, 2: Tit. ii: 1-6; iii: 1, 2.

The isolation and aloofness of the Christians and their unwillingness to take part in social, domestic, business and public life, savored of contempt and led to their being considered bad citizens and enemies of the human race. They were regarded as holding a foreign and degrading superstition, despising the Roman gods and bringing disasters upon the Empire. Denying the deity of the Emperor and refusing to pay divine honors to his image, they were guilty of treason, and also showed themselves enemies of the State by predicting the end of the Empire and of the world. All this was intensified by the popular rumors that their nightly meetings were celebrated with in-

human rites and Thyestian feasts. They were regarded as a people shunning the light, skulking in darkness, morose and silent in public, but garrulous in corners. There are instances of their protection, by Roman officers, from Jewish fanaticism, as seen in Acts; but in general, unprotected by the law, they were an easy prey to the bigotry and vengeance of their Jewish neighbors. The ill-will of the religious authorities was united with public opinion. The Romans soon realized, also, that if they were Jews they were a different kind from any they had known. According to Tacitus, the persecution of Nero, which began for the sake of diverting public attention toward them as responsible for the burning of Rome, was continued as a permanent police measure under the form of a general prosecution of Christians as a sect dangerous to the public safety. St. Peter and St. Paul probably suffered at Rome during this reign.

Nero's action served as a precedent in every province. No general edict or formal law was necessary in dealing with the cases which came before the imperial judges. Thus, in the time of Nero, the Empire for the first time adopted a definite attitude toward the new religion, which it had treated hitherto with indifference or contempt. Whether Vespasian allowed the persecution to continue or not, we cannot say.[1] It is probable, however, that he did. At any rate we find it in Domitian's reign, and not due, as in Nero's

[1] See Ramsay, p. 257, and Jackson, p. 52, note.

case, to any personal idiosyncrasies. The most important victim was Flavius Clemens, the Emperor's cousin. The first use of Cæsar worship as a test of Christians was made probably in Domitian's reign. Really, persecution for the Name, on the general charge of *odium generis humani*, began in Nero's reign, and continued, under the indefinite *coercitio* of the magistrates, urged on by the hostility of the fanatical masses.

Domitian wanted to restore the national cult, of which an important part or symbol was the worship of the Emperor. Christianity itself was disloyalty under Domitian, therefore Christianity was treated as treasonable. Probably St. John suffered martyrdom in his reign. Not criminal acts, but the whole principle showed the crime. Ramsay says, "The silence between Nero and Domitian is due to lack of historians and attention to other things. If the early Christians had given much thought to their persecutions they would not have conquered the world."

The members of a sect whose tendency was to unsettle the foundations of society were held as outlaws and the very name treated as a crime. The attitude of the State toward the Christians during the Flavian period is well stated by Mommsen: "The persecution of the Christians was a standing matter, as was that of robbers or brigands." The real motive of the imperial policy was political, not religious. The imperial system was inconsistent with the Christian

principles of life and society; collision was inevitable.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Glover, T. R.—Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. 3rd ed. Lond., 1907.

Farrar, F. W.—Early Days of Christianity. 2 vols. Lond., 1882.

Ramsay, W. M.—The Church in the Roman Empire. N. Y., 1893.

Westcott, B. F.—The Two Empires. Lond., 1909.

Cunningham, Wm.—Churches of Asia. Lond., 1880.

Herkless, John.—Early Christian Martyrs. Lond., 1904.

University of Pennsylvania Reprints, Vol. IV, No 1.

Foxe.—Acts and Monuments.

See also A II, §2, and A III, §2.

A. CHAPTER II.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE
98 A.D. TO 180 A.D.

§1. The Spread of Christianity

DURING this period, Christianity spread farther and farther through and beyond the Empire; was strengthened and consolidated, and met the attacks from within and without with increasing energy and confidence. Christianity was now fairly embarked on its world conquest. The destruction of Jerusalem 70 A.D. and its complete demolition 135 A.D. completed the separation of Christianity from Judaism. The growing organization of the Church made its spread all the faster and surer, so that at the close of this period certain places began to come into prominence as centres of organized Christianity.

Cæsarea now became the chief centre in Palestine, and the sea coast towns received the Gospel. Antioch grew in importance as a centre from which Christianity spread eastward to the heathen world of Syria, Mesopotamia, Parthia, Armenia, Chaldæa and Persia, with Edessa as its chief centre.

Still larger conquests were made in Asia Minor along the west coast, and in Bithynia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, until it became the great centre of

Christian life and activity. Pliny's letter is authority for the wide spread of Christianity in all places and among all classes.

From Asia Minor it spread across the Ægean Sea to Thrace, Macedonia and Achaia, with Corinth as a chief centre. From Asia Minor also to Gaul; where the chief centres were Arles, Lyons and Vienne; from which it spread to Britain, probably at this time.

Alexandria and Rome were also centres of influence and of missionary enterprise. From Alexandria, Christianity spread through Egypt and the Thebaid; to the East through Arabia, and by the West through Cyrenaica; as is shown by the Sahidic and two Coptic versions of the Scriptures, and early Christian writings. Bostra was one of the chief centres in the East.

From Rome it crossed the Mediterranean to Mauretania and Numidia in North Africa, with Carthage as the chief centre. Here was the early home of Latin Christianity, when Rome itself was a Greek religious colony. At this time, also, Christianity was established in Spain.

Already, undoubtedly, soldiers from the various German tribes, serving in the imperial armies, were converted to Christianity; but its establishment in the northern provinces took place probably in the next period.

During this period Asia Minor was the spiritual centre of Christianity. Here it followed very evidently the lines by which the trade of central Asia was carried to Rome. Many causes have been

assigned for its wide and rapid spread. The five named by Gibbon in his famous fifteenth chapter, are: intolerant zeal, future rewards and punishments, miracles, austere morals and compact organization. Kurtz sums it up in a line: "The emptiness and corruption of paganism were the negative, the divine nature and power of the Gospel were the positive means of this wonderful extension." In detail the reasons may be stated as follows:

(1) Great hope and belief in immortality. (2) High morality and supreme importance of it. (3) Pure spiritual conception of the unity and personality of God. (4) Noble fortitude and endurance of trial and persecution. (5) Zeal and earnestness. (6) Charity. (7) Organization.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Dill, S.— Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. Lond., 1904.

Thomas, Emile — Roman Life under the Cæsars. N. Y., 1899.

Uhlhorn, G.— Christian Charity in the Ancient Church. Trans. N. Y., 1883.

Friedländer — Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire. Trans. 3 vols. Lond., 1909.

Harnack, A.— The Mission and Expansion of Christianity. Vol. II, pp. 89-96.

Merivale, Charles —Conversion of the Roman Empire. N. Y., 1867.

Lecky, W. E. H.— History of European Morals. 2 vols. N. Y., 1895.

Ramsay, W. M.— Church in the Roman Empire.

§2. The Persecutions Under "The Good Emperors"

The Accession of Nerva (96 A.D.) marked the beginning of the reign of "The Five Good Emperors." Nerva himself (96-98 A.D.) was tolerant to the Christians, but with the reign of Trajan (98-117 A.D.) we note the beginning of a time of bitter and continued persecution. The high statesmanship of these Emperors and their devotion to the interests of the Empire made them see more clearly the essential antagonism of Christianity to the principles of the Empire as they understood them.

The persecutions were political rather than religious. They were less capricious but more rigorous. They were regulated by law; but although no edicts were issued against the Christians, and few efforts made to search them out, the imperial rescripts authorized the severest penalties against those who were brought before the tribunals and refused to renounce the Christian name and to pay divine honors to the Emperor. The well-known correspondence between Trajan and Pliny, the Governor of Bithynia (112 A.D.) who described Christianity as "a depraved and unreasonable superstition," indicates the imperial policy of the whole period. The whole procedure was regulated, and false or anonymous accusations were not to be allowed. His successor, Hadrian, in his rescript followed the same lines. The reported rescript of Antoninus Pius is probably spurious, but

his attitude seems to have been a more rigorous enforcement of the laws against anonymous and fanatical accusations.

Marcus Aurelius, in consistency with his firmness and high conscientious scruples, enforced the law more severely, and by new edicts encouraged bringing the Christians before the tribunals.

The martyrdoms of Symeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, took place in the reign of Trajan. Justin Martyr and Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, were martyred in the reign of Antoninus Pius.

During the reign of Marcus Aurelius occured the terrible persecutions of Lyons and Vienne. It is estimated that at least one hundred must have been martyred during his reign; more than in any previous one.

It is to be remembered, however, that these persecutions were not due to religious differences, to bigotry and fanatical intolerance, but solely (as far as the Emperors of the second century were concerned) to imperial policy and the desire to uphold the integrity of the Empire, regarding Christianity as "sheer obstinacy." Indeed Melito, Bishop of Sardis in the closing years of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, mentions 177 A.D. the new decrees as causing much suffering in Asia.

It was this imperial policy that the Apologists, who began to write in the reigns of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, recognized and tried to meet in their

writings. It also explains the attitude of Marcus Aurelius, one of the noblest, most conscientious and most philosophical of all the Roman Emperors. From the point of view of a conscientious Emperor, the Christians were not merely the holders of a different or even erroneous religion, for, as such, they might have been pitied or dismissed with contempt; but they were enemies to the integrity and unity of the Empire, and disturbers of public peace and order; and any Emperor who cared for these things must destroy them.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Addis, W. E.— Christianity and the Roman Empire. Lond., 1893.

Hardy, E. G.— Christianity and Roman Government. Lond., 1894.

Hardy, E. G.— (Later edition.) Studies in Roman History. Lond., 1906.

Hardy, E. G.— Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan. Lond., 1889.

Renan, E.— Marcus Aurelius.

See also Bibliography, A I, §8, and A III, §2.

§3. The Apostolic Fathers

The earliest writings outside of the New Testament are the so-called Apostolic Fathers; formerly numbering seven, now numbering nine.

1. The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, c. 70-165 A.D.

2. The Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, c. 96 A.D., to which is appended —

3. A Homily, or discourse, formerly called the Second Epistle of Clement, but now believed not to be his, although it is an early composition written probably before 140 A.D. at Rome or Corinth.

4. "The Shepherd," by Hermas, c. 97 A.D., by a member of the Church at Rome, one of the early Prophets. It was probably completed in its present form by Hermas, a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, c. 141-154 A.D.

5. The Epistle of Barnabas, so-called, written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem to which it refers.

6. The Epistles of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, 106-115 A.D. The Epistles to various Churches and one to Polycarp of Smyrna, have come down to us in three recensions: a longer form, comprising twelve Epistles in Greek and three in Latin; a shorter Greek form, containing Epistles to six Churches and one to Polycarp, edited by Voss and called the Vossian Recension; and a still shorter Syriac form comprising three Epistles, probably extracts from the originals, edited by Cureton and called the Curetonian Recension. The shorter Greek recension is generally regarded as the genuine and original form.

7. The Epistle of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna.

8. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Galatia; suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, c. 162 A.D. He

compiled a book of traditions and anecdotes of which only extracts remain.

9. The Epistle to Diognetus, by an anonymous writer.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Farrar, F. W.— Lives of the Fathers.
Hall, E. H.— Papias and his Contemporaries. Boston, 1899.
Lightfoot, J. B.— Essays on Supernatural Religion.
Didache — Editions by Hitchcock and Brown, N. Y., 1885. C. Taylor, Camb., 1886. Ph. Schaff, N. Y., 1889. Spence, Lond., 1885. Harnack, Leipzig, 1884. C. H. Hole, Lond., 1894.
Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible.
See also General Bibliography V.

§4. The Christian Apologists

There was a remarkable literary fertility in Asia Minor during the middle of the second century. It is the great age of Christian Apologetics, the period of hope and fear, which coincides with the age of the Antonines, the "Good Emperors" of the first eighty years of the second century. These writings were mainly under Marcus Aurelius, a wise and good emperor, yet understanding Christianity so little that it seemed to him inconceivable that such a religion could be worth study or that it could be expected to alter the laws of the Empire in its behalf. In vain Christians tried to get even a hearing; they found that they were dealing with a statesman who was all the more inflexible because he was so conscientious. Peace returned to the Church after his death, 180 A.D. His son Commodus, one of the worst emperors Rome

had ever known, did not enforce the laws against the Christians, but it was just because he did not care for the integrity of the Empire.

The Christian Apologists were the first Christian theologians, for their defense of Christianity was the presentation of it as a philosophy containing the highest wisdom and truth. The writings of many of the earliest Apologists are lost, but their names, and some references to their works have come down to us. Of these we mention :—

1. Quadratus of Athens addressed an Apology to Hadrian in which he refers to some whom Jesus had cured or raised from the dead, as living until his time. (Euseb. H. E., iv: 3.)

2. The Apology by Marcianus Aristides, addressed to Antoninus Pius. It was supposed only fragments remained, until the discovery of a Syriac translation, 1889 A.D., in the convent of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai, where Tischendorf discovered the famous fourth century manuscript of the Bible. The work is also noteworthy as containing the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed.

3. Justin the Martyr, a Greek born in Palestine, educated in the highest schools of philosophy. Moved by the fortitude of Christians in enduring martyrdom, his conversion presents a type of the world of educated thought in the second century. As a Christian he still wore his philosopher's cloak. (Euseb. H. E., iv: 11-18.) At Ephesus he held his famous Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, and wrote

his Apology, and a so-called second one, a supplement to the first, addressed to Antoninus Pius, about 152 A.D., which probably never reached him.

4. Tatian, a Greek Sophist, was born in Mesopotamia. He went to Rome and was won to Christianity by Justin Martyr about 150 A.D. He travelled widely and was well acquainted with all forms of heathen philosophy and religion. His work is called a Discourse to the Greeks. Of great importance for the history of the canon and of exegesis is his *Diatesseron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, of which we now have the full text. (Cambridge Texts and Studies.)

5. Aristo of Pella is reputed to be the author of an Apology written at this time in the form of a dialogue between a Jewish Christian, Jason, and an Alexandrian Jew, Papiscus.

6. Miltiades of Asia Minor, c. 165 A.D., presented an Apology to Marcus Aurelius. (Euseb. H. E., v: 17.)

7. Claudius Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, about 170 A.D., addressed one to Marcus Aurelius, of which perhaps only a line remains. (Euseb. H. E., iv: 16.)

8. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius speaks of the "new decrees" against the Christians. He was one of the great lights of the Church in Asia Minor. Eusebius names over twenty of his writings of very great value, but of which, unfortunately, we possess only fragments.

9. Athenagoras, like Aristides, an Athenian philosopher, a few years later addressed one to the same emperor. Of his work we have the entire text.

10. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, in the early years of Commodus, c. 180 A.D., wrote a treatise in three books addressed to a certain Autolycus in answer to pagan objectors.

11. The Octavius of Minucius Felix, a dialogue between a cultured heathen and an intelligent and philosophical Christian, belongs probably to the close of this period, though some scholars place it after Tertullian, as it is evident one used the other.

The effect of all this apologetic literature was instructive and strengthening to the Christians, but seems to have had little effect on the persecutions or the persecutors. The Church's conquest was gained not by apologetics and theology, but by the moral and spiritual power evidenced in the virtues of the Christians themselves, who lived as heroes in that heroic age. Thus men were drawn to Christ, and thus Christ conquered Rome and will conquer the world.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Watson, F.— Defenders of the Faith.

Purves, G. T.— Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity. N. Y., 1889.

Harris, J. Rendell — The Apology of Aristides. Camb. Texts and Studies. Edited by J. A. Robinson, Vol. I. Camb., 1891.

§5. Ebionism and the Pseudo-Clementine System

Under this head may be grouped the various forms of Jewish Christianity which held aloof from the uni-

versalism of the Gospel. Not content with observing the Mosaic law themselves, they maintained that it was binding on all Christians, making Christianity merely a reformed, not a transformed Judaism. There were many of this sect of varying degrees of strictness—Essenes, Nazarenes, Elkesaites—all exalting Judaism at the expense of Christianity.

The word Ebionites comes from the Hebrew, meaning poor and humble, for there is no evidence of a founder named Ebion, as some have supposed. The destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem and the consequent cessation of the temple worship, led to the gradual disappearance of non-sectarian Jewish Christianity, and its amalgamation with Gentile Christianity. The remnant of Jewish Christianity which continued to cling to its own peculiar principles and practices remained stagnant in these heretical sects, which later became permeated with Gnostic elements and developed into the comprehensive Pseudo-Clementine system, based on writings of the latter part of the second century called the Homilies and Recognitions, attributed to Clement of Rome; and emerged as a recognized Gnostic sect under Cerinthus.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Sorley, W. R.—Jewish Christians and Judaism. Camb., 1881.
Hort, F. J. A.—Clementine Recognitions. Lond., 1901.
Hort, F. J. A.—Judaistic Christianity. Lond., 1904.
Dorner, J. A.—History of the Doctrine of Person of Christ. Div. I, Vol. I, pp. 118-217. Five volumes in two divisions. Edinb., 1861-1863.

§6. Gnosticism

This period saw the rise of three great systems of religious thought which threatened for a time to break up the unity of the Church and the integrity of the Christian faith, but in the end proved to be influences of the strongest kind to strengthen that unity and to establish that integrity. These three were the systems of the Gnostics, of Marcion, and of Montanus.

Gnosticism was the mightiest, most dangerous and most influential system, and threatened to sweep Christianity off its feet and to work more havoc than the bitterest persecution from without.

Ebionism was the result of the attempt to incorporate into Christianity the narrow formalism of Judaism. Gnosticism was the result of the attempt to blend with Christianity the religious notions of pagan mythology, cosmology and philosophy. It was comparatively easy to keep out Ebionism and its Gnostic tendencies, but the Gnosticism of Gentile Christianity was a much more difficult and insidious foe.

The struggle strengthened the Church, however, by bringing it to a deeper consciousness of its own faith and helping it to realize its own theology and organization. The Catholic Church, in the full strength of its complete organization, was the form in which Christianity emerged victorious from this mighty struggle.

The problems were the origin of the world and of

evil, and the process, means and end of the world's development and redemption. The Gnostic theory of the world's origin was borrowed largely from heathen sources colored by Judaism, and the theory of redemption was borrowed from Christianity, allegorized in some cases almost beyond recognition. At the basis lay the dualism of God and Matter; the latter either non-substantial or a hostile and violently opposed principle.

The principle of emanation, or of evolution, in a sense of divine essences or æons as intermediaries, is used to explain the processes of the creation, development and redemption of the world.

There is posited a world of light, "the Pleroma," and three phases of existence, the Pneumatic, or life of the Spirit, the Psychic, or Animal Soul, and the Hylic, or Carnal and Material Body.

One of the lowest and weakest of the æons is the Demiurge or Creator, for creation is the first step toward redemption, which is accomplished by a divine Saviour, through gnosis (knowledge) and asceticism.

Humanity is divided into three classes according to which one of the three elements predominates in each man:—The Pneumatic, who are capable of and receive the Gnosis; the Psychic, who are capable only of faith; and the Hylic, subject to, and under the control of matter.

Redemption consists of the conquest and exclusion of matter, and is accomplished through knowledge and

asceticism. It is an artificial or mechanical, almost chemical process, rather than an ethical one.

Sanctification is a physical struggle with matter, and the withholding from material enjoyments or from anything that acknowledges or confers power upon matter. The Gnostics were therefore originally very strict in their moral discipline, but in some cases went to the other extreme of licentiousness in order to show their contempt of the body and disregard of the laws of the Demiurge, thus denying the responsibility of the soul for the weakness of the flesh.

The movement resulted in the boldest and most brilliant syncretism the world has ever seen. Its attitude toward Scripture and the Gospels was varied. Allegorizing interpretations were based upon it; or it was denied, as having been falsified by the Apostles, and remodelled writings were substituted and new pseudo-literature issued.

Esoteric teaching by verbal tradition, however, played a more important and more authoritative part than the Scriptures.

They had their own Scriptures, Gospels, Epistles and Treatises, Psalms and Prophets, few of which have come down to us, although some are coming to light in Coptic versions, and some are produced from the descriptions and quotations given by the early Fathers, especially Irenæus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Tertullian, Theodoret, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. In opposition to them the Church maintained the

solidarity of the two Testaments, the authority of its own Gospels and Epistles, the reality of the Gospel story, the authority of the moral code, and the redemption and sanctity of the human body against a perverse asceticism on the one hand, and a lawless libertinism on the other.

The bestiality of the forces of Nature and the lack of any moral discrimination in their action, together with the general working of law without regard to particular instances, seemed to give evidence of a Deity deficient in knowledge, or in love, or in power, or perhaps in all three. Above this world-power, therefore, the Gnostic posited the Infinite Goodness, manifesting Himself in love and providing a means of redemption.

The Jehovah of Israel, therefore, was made responsible for Nature and the Law, while the God of the Gospel revealed in Jesus Christ the goodness and absolute perfection of the True God. Yet the Demiurge, Jehovah, must be explained. Marcion did not try to solve the problem, but the Gnostics brought in their series of emanations and æons.

Although Gnosticism included a great variety of sects, there are certain points on which they all agreed, but there are others on which their divergences were considerable. Neander makes three classes, as follows:—

First, Gnostic sects, which, attaching themselves to Judaism, held to a gradual development of the Theocracy among mankind from an original foundation of

it in the race. Their great teachers were Cerinthus, Basilides, Valentinus (who was the most profound, talented and imaginative of all the Gnostics), Heracleon and Bardesanes.

Second, Gnostic sects opposed to Judaism and inclining to the side of the Pagan element:—The Ophites, Cainites, Carpocratians, Prodicians, Nicolaitans and Simonians; all antinomian sects tending to licentiousness and libertinism.

Third, Gnostic sects opposed to Judaism but striving to hold Christianity in what they conceived to be its purity and absolute independence:—Saturninus, Tatian and the Encratites (rigorous ascetics), and Marcion. Owing, however, to the greater importance and peculiarly characteristic position and influence of Marcion, Harnack and later scholars consider him in a separate class.

This classification is perhaps on the whole the most logical and helpful one. If we followed the chronological order, which, however, is very difficult to determine, it would appear that the earliest Gnostics took hardly any account of Christianity, and knew little about the life of Jesus, but that Christian ideas and beliefs gradually invaded the Gnostic philosophy and brought it nearer and nearer to the standards of the Catholic faith. How far Christianity was in its turn influenced by Gnosticism is a subject on which there is a wide divergence of opinion. The origin of Gnosticism was traced by the early Fathers to Simon of Samaria (Acts viii: 9 ff.), though

by some it was traced back to Cleobius and Dositheus, earlier than either Simon or Christianity. Euseb. H. E., iv: 22. Iren. i: 23. Pseudo-Tert. De Præscr. 46 (Duchesne, p. 116).

Pfleiderer declares that it was a religion itself, and did not arise originally either from Christianity or from Greek philosophy (Christian Origins, p. 249). This may account for traces of what seem like Gnostic ideas in some of the Epistles, e.g. Colossians. It may well have been earlier than Christianity, but assimilated Christianity as soon as it came in contact with it, and undoubtedly received fresh inspiration and vitality from it.

The most brilliant period in its history was the second century, commencing with the age of Hadrian. At the beginning of the third century there was scarcely one of the more cultivated congregations throughout the whole of the Roman Empire that was not affected by it. Yet we never find the number of regular Gnostic congregations exceeding that of the Catholic. Soon after this, the season of decay sets in. The only complete Gnostic production which has been preserved, the Pistis Sophia, belongs to the third century.

Its productive power was exhausted; and while on the one hand it was driven back by the Catholic ecclesiastical development, on the other hand it was outrun by Marcionism and by Manichæism.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Neander, A.—Church History. Vol. I, pp. 336-458.
Gwatkin, H. M.—Early Church. Vol. II, pp. 19-72.
King, C. W.—The Gnostics and their Remains. Lond., 1887.
Mansel, H. L.—The Gnostic Heresies. Lond., 1875.
Hatch, E.—Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity. 4th ed. Lond., 1892.
Bright, Wm.—Waymarks in Church History. Chap. II. Lond., 1894.
Baur.—First Three Centuries. Vol. I, pp. 185-245.
Harnack. A.—History of Dogma. Vol. I, pp. 222-266.
Dorner, J. A.—Person of Christ. Vol. I, pp. 218-252.
Meed, G. R. S.—Pistis Sophia, the Gnostic Gospel. Lond., 1896.

§7. Marcion and His Churches

Marcion was a wealthy shipmaster who was born in Sinope in Pontus, Asia Minor, and about 140 A.D. went to Rome where, probably, he was converted to Christianity, as he at once made over his fortune to the Church. The story of his being the son of the Bishop of Sinope and excommunicated by his father for the seduction of a young girl, is a later tradition inspired, probably, by the hatred he stirred up against himself, as it is utterly inconsistent with his life and teachings at Rome. He threw himself whole-souled into the moral life and practical ethics of the Gospel, and, like an earlier Luther and Augustine, followed the teachings of St. Paul. Indeed, he soon came to regard St. Paul as the only truly representative Apostle of Christ, and was the first to lay down a distinct canon of New Testament Scriptures

in which he included only the Gospel of St. Luke, with many changes and omissions (especially of the first three chapters) and ten Epistles of St. Paul, omitting the Pastoral Epistles.

Deeply impressed with the Pauline antithesis of the Law and the Gospel, he developed a system of antitheses as the basis of his conception of Christianity, and carried to an extreme the Pauline doctrine of Free Grace and Justification by Faith. Emphasizing the antitheses between Faith and Law, Grace and Justice, the Old Testament and the New Covenant, he saw a complete antagonism between the Old Testament and the Gospel. He refused to employ the allegorical method, which was the favorite method of rationalizing the Old Testament, especially among the Gnostics, and interpreted it literally. Thus he found in the Old Testament a just but merciless God, the Creator, whose Messiah was a War Prince.

Jesus, on the other hand, revealed the good and beneficent God, and owed nothing to the Creator, as he bore only the appearance of a physical body (Docetism). He saw no preparation in the Old Testament for the revelation in the New. Jesus, he maintained, came suddenly in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, without birth or growth, and with an absolutely new revelation for which nothing in the previous history of the world had prepared the way. His doctrine, founded upon Docetism, led up to Dualism, like that of the Gnostics, though starting out from different premises and, unlike them, rejecting Allegory, Gnosis, which

he regarded as inferior to Faith, and esoteric teaching, making all teaching public; even allowing catechumens to be present at the Holy Communion. Hence he cannot be classed strictly with the Gnostics, but stands by himself. He attempted to set aside the Old Testament foundations of Christianity, to purify tradition and to reform Christendom on the basis of the Pauline Gospel. After the failure of his attempts to reform the Church, he founded Churches of his own, separating from the Church in Rome, 144 A.D. (when his money was returned to him), though he still remained there, apparently, until his death, perhaps twenty or twenty-five years later. His activity and influence were enormous, and he had many followers. He made moral conduct the basis of his teaching, and theology secondary. He founded his Churches on brotherly equality, absence of ceremonial and strict ascetic discipline. Nearly all the early Fathers wrote against him. His use of the New Testament showed the Church the importance of an authoritative Canon of Scripture. His followers were noted for their moral earnestness and practical tendency. They made many changes in his system but reverenced him in the highest manner as the most Holy Master. His most famous disciple was Apelles, who survived him about twenty years.

At the Council of 692 A.D. it was declared that Marcionites, Manichæans and Valentinians must be baptized anew.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. I, pp. 266-286.
Jackson, F. J. Foakes.—Christian Difficulties of the Second and Twentieth Centuries. (A Study of Marcion.) Camb., 1900.

On the comparison of Marcion's Gospel with St. Luke's, see—
Sanday.—Gospels in the Second Century. pp. 204 ff.
Westcott.—Canon of the New Testament. pp. 345 ff.
Salmon.—Introduction to the New Testament. pp. 242 ff.

§8. Montanus and Montanism

This also was a reform movement and had its rise in Asia Minor, its leader, Montanus, being a Phrygian. Its origin and nature are to be explained by the conditions and experiences of the Church in Asia Minor contending against Gnostics and Gnosticizing tendencies. It took its stand on the reality and literalness of the doctrines and facts of the Scriptures; seeking to revive and to continue the belief in the speedy second coming of Christ, and the spiritual ministry of the Church. It therefore laid down a severely ascetic discipline, accused the Church of becoming worldly, and opposed to the growing hierarchical organization of the Church the rights of the laity and a line of spiritually inspired prophets. A sort of second century Quaker movement.

About the middle of the second century Montanus appeared at Pepuza in Phrygia and declared himself to be the Paraclete who fulfilled the promise of Jesus (St. John xiv: 16; xvi: 7), and proclaimed the speedy second coming of Christ to Pepuza as the New Jerusa-

lem. He ordered stricter asceticism, increased and regular fasting, virginity, and a discipline of repentance with no readmission of the lapsed. The movement spread rapidly. Before the end of the year 170, several synods, the earliest of which we have any record, had been held against the Montanists, resulting in their exclusion from the Catholic Church. Montanus then organized his followers into a separate community.

Thus the main effort of Montanus was to form a completely new organization of Christendom, a new undivided Christian Commonwealth separated from the world. Whole communities became followers of the new prophet in Phrygia and Asia. But the idea of a new organization died out, and Montanism in the clear light of history appears rather as a religious movement already deadened though still very powerful.

Even when the General Councils declared heretical baptism valid if given properly, in the name of the Trinity, the Montanist baptism was excluded because the Paraclete of Montanus could not be recognized as the Holy Spirit of the Trinity.

Among the Montanists those especially inspired were reverenced as prophets; and two prophetesses, Prisca (or Priscilla) and Maximilla, were prominent. The martyrs of Lyons, some of whom had come from Phrygia, wrote from prison (177 A.D.) a letter in their favor to the Bishop of Rome, which was carried by Irenæus; but Praxeas, a confessor of Asia Minor,

turned the feeling against them and secured their condemnation.

Maximilla died 180 A.D., and Montanu sand Prisca before that. After them prophecy ceased, but the movement grew. From Rome it spread to North Africa about 200 A.D., where Tertullian, a little later, joined the movement, and to his writings we owe much of our knowledge of their life and teachings.

The supreme authority of their prophets and the emphasis laid on the universal priesthood of all Christians, tended strongly to the strengthening of the constitutional form of the Episcopate, and to an objective standard in a fixed canon of Scripture and a definite rule of faith.

The early apologists, like Claudius Apollinaris and Miltiades, and perhaps Melito, included them in their opposition to the enemies of the Church. On account of their use of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse there arose a definite sect in opposition called the Alogi.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

De Soyres, J.—Montanism and the Primitive Church. Camb., 1878.

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. II, pp. 94-111.

Cunningham, Wm.—Churches of Asia. Lond., 1880. (Appendix contains valuable extracts from writers of the second century.)

Neander, A.—Antignostikus.

§9. The Consolidation of the Catholic Church

Whatever may be said about the origin of the Episcopate, this was the period of its complete and universal establishment. Its strength and importance were recognized as due largely to the conditions we have just been considering: (1) Need of unity; (2) A single representative in correspondence and hospitality; (3) For doctrinal authority; (4) In the celebration of the Eucharist. Schaff says: "It should be admitted that the tendency toward an episcopal concentration of presbyteral power may be traced to the close of the Apostolic Age." And "It is a matter of fact that the episcopal form of government was universally established in the Eastern and Western Churches as early as the middle of the second century. Even early heretical sects like the Ebionites were organized on this plan; and the later ones, Novatians and Donatists, did not depart from it."—(Schaff I, p. 494; II, p. 144.) The whole Church spirit of the age tended toward centralization. Everywhere the demand was felt for compact, solid unity. In the face of the persecutions, heresies and schisms, the preservation of the Church depended upon it. Such a unity existed in the bishops. The Episcopate was not created but evolved by these conditions: it lay involved in the original constitution of the Church; it was developed and strengthened by these conditions and the way in which it met them. Lindsay admits that what he calls the change from the twofold to the

threefold ministry did not come by any sudden alteration which gave rise to contentions, but came so naturally as to make it seem that there was no change. The significance is seen in the relation of the officials to the public worship, especially the Eucharist. There could not be a collegiate superintendence of the Lord's Supper; there must then have been some head from the beginning; that is, a threefold organization.

This recognition of the early, manifest and open establishment of the Episcopate and the admission that there is no sign of change from an earlier order, or of any contention at a sudden alteration, removes the oldest and strongest arguments against the early origin of the Episcopate. The fact that we have no clear description of it as a settled and established order in the New Testament is not by itself a valid argument against it. The times and conditions of the New Testament were opposed to anything of the sort. But the threefold order of Christ, the Twelve and the Seventy; of James, the Apostles and the Elders, at Jerusalem; of the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons in the Ignatian Epistles, shows a continuance of official form and order by whatever name the officers may be called. It needed only the conditions and circumstances of the second century to bring it out and to develop and consolidate it into the unity and episcopal organization of the Catholic Church. Harnack speaks of "the uniform constitutional system, such as we find almost everywhere in the period after Hadrian."

The best evidence for the existence of a monarchical Episcopate from the beginning, is the fact that nowhere is to be found the least trace of a change of organization. The position of the single bishop existed from the beginning, but it became gradually more conspicuous as the needs and conditions of the time led to the placing of a greater emphasis upon it.

The following facts may be regarded as established: (1) To some extent in the earlier period the words presbyter and bishop were synonymous; i.e. a bishop may be called a presbyter, but it does not follow that every presbyter was a bishop, for if so there would be no use for both terms. The probability is that bishop and presbyter are not the same office nor are the names absolutely interchangeable; but the bishops are chosen from the presbyterate for a special work, and while retaining their high position and honor as presbyters are yet known also by a special title. (2) In each community the authority may have belonged originally to a college of presbyter-bishops. This does not mean that the Episcopate in the actual sense of the term may have been plural, because in each Church the college of presbyter-bishops did not exercise an independent supreme power but was subject to the apostles or their delegates. (3) When the missionaries left and the prophetic office died out, the direction fell on the local authority, who thus received apostolic succession. This local superior authority, of apostolic origin, was conferred upon a monarchical bishop, as the term is understood to-

day. This is proved by the case of Jerusalem, where James, not one of the Twelve, held the first place; and by the Ignatian Epistles.

In the Didache itinerant preachers are termed apostles. An apostle is allowed to remain only one or two days; if he tries to stay longer he is a false prophet. But provision is made for his settling permanently; in which case, of course, he would be the head of the community. In other communities where no mention is made of a monarchical Episcopate until the middle of the second century, there is no trace found of a change of organization; and consequently no valid reason to suppose that it did not already exist, at least in germ.

Harnack says, "There is not the slightest ground for denying the application to the earliest period of what we know with the utmost certainty from the time of the Ignatian Epistles onward; namely, the Bishops, Deacons and Presbyters, were purely officials of the individual community."—(Constitution and Law, p. 238.)

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. II, pp. 67-93.

Harnack, A.—Mission and Expansion of Christianity. I, pp. 431-486.

Harnack, A.—Constitution and Law of the Church. (Cf. pp. 96-102, and Duchesne, Early History, pp. 62-70.)

Duchesne.—Early History of the Church. pp. 40-105.

Allen, A. V. G.—Christian Institutions. pp. 5-136.

Wordsworth, John.—Ministry of Grace. 2nd ed. Lond., 1903.

Lindsay, T. M.—The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries. Lond., 1903.

Gore, Charles.—Ministry of the Christian Church. 3rd ed. Lond., 1893.

Hatch, E.—Organization of the Early Christian Churches. Bampton Lectures. Lond., 1880.

Durrell, J. C. V.—The Historic Church. Camb., 1906.

Hooker, Richard.—Ecclesiastical Polity. Book VII.

Wordsworth, Charles.—Outlines of the Christian Ministry. Lond., 1872.

Cunningham, John—The Growth of the Church. Lond., 1886.

Sanday, William.—Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church. 2nd ed. N. Y., 1899.

Lefroy, William.—The Christian Ministry. Lond., 1890. "For those who claim to exercise sacerdotal functions and to administer sacerdotal authority."

Lowrie, Walter—The Church and its Organization. N. Y., 1904.

Lowrie's book is an exposition of Sohm's Kirchenrecht; which is critically considered by Harnack in the last half of his book entitled "The Law and Constitution of the Church." This latter work presents the latest phase of the development of Harnack's own theory as set forth in its earlier form in his "History of Dogma;" later in "The Mission and Expansion," and in "The Teaching of the Twelve;" and last in "The Law and Constitution."

§10. The Rule of Faith

The second of the three great institutions of the Church, established to meet the dangers and confusion of the second century, was the Rule of Faith, later and traditionally known as the Apostles' Creed. An outline of the doctrine common to all Churches, introduced first of all as a confession of faith professed by candidates for baptism, obtained currency

at a very early date. It was imparted to the catechumen by word of mouth and hence written records are not found until later. Although the exact form varied somewhat in different localities, the essential outline was the same. There are three general types: Italian, North African, and Western. The oldest and simplest was that used in Rome which may be traced back to about the middle of the second century. It omits the phrases "Maker of Heaven and Earth," "was conceived," "suffered," "dead," "He descended into hell," "God," "Almighty," "Catholic," "the Communion of Saints" and "the Life Everlasting;" though these additions were made probably before the end of the fourth century. Traces of the Creed are found in Ignatius, in Justin Martyr, and more fully in the Apology of Aristides. It is still more complete in Irenæus, Adv. Hær. I, x: 1; III, iv: 2; IV, xxxiii: 7; and also in Tertullian, De Præs. Her. 13 and 36; De Virg. Vel. 1, Adv. Prax. 2.

Irenæus says of the Rule of Faith that it is the unalterable kernel of the truth which Christians have received at baptism. (Adv. Hær. I, ix: 4.)

SPECIAL REFERENCES

McGiffert, A. C.—The Apostles' Creed. N. Y., 1902.

Burn, A. E.—The Articles of the Apostles' Creed. Trans. from Zahn. Lond., 1899.

Burn, A. E.—An Introduction to the Creeds. Lond., 1899.

Swete, H. B.—The Apostles' Creed. 3rd ed. Camb., 1899.

Harnack, A.—The Apostles' Creed. Trans., *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1893. Also translation by Stewart Means.

Heurtley, C. A.—A History of the Earlier Formularies of the Faith. Lond. 1892.

Lumby, J. R.—History of the Creeds. 3rd ed. Lond., 1887.

Gibson, E. C. S.—The Three Creeds. Oxford Library of Practical Theology. Lond., 1908.

Schaff, P.—The Creeds of Christendom. 3 vols. 4th ed. N. Y., 1899.

Swainson, C. A.—The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds. Lond., 1875.

§11. The Canon of Scripture.

The appeal made by the Gnostics to alleged apostolic men and to a secret tradition, and Marcion's canon of Pauline Scripture, brought the Church to a realization of the importance of a fixed authoritative canon. The Gnostics, indeed, were the first to apply exegetical methods to New Testament Scriptures and to appeal to apostolic writings as authoritative, in order to defend their divergence from Catholic tradition; and they began to explain the existing written form of the evangelical tradition according to their own ideas by asserting an esoteric tradition, and by means of allegorical interpretation, which, in the case of the Old Testament, was indeed in universal use among Christians. They went further, in the falsification of Scripture, particularly in the alteration of the Gospels by omissions and additions. By the transformation of the evangelical tradition, the heretical tendency gained credence. To this period belong many of the apocryphal Gospels and other writings; e.g., the Gospel of the Hebrews, of the Egyptians, Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Peter, Acts of John,

Acts of Thomas, Acts of Andrew, Acts of Paul and Thekla.

Marcion, for the first time, set up a closed canon of apostolic writings in the ten, though expurgated, Epistles of Paul, and a Gospel corresponding to our Third Gospel with some omissions and changes. The earliest testimonies to the existence of the New Testament as a whole, are the catalogue contained in the famous Muratonian Fragment, a Western document, 170 A.D., and the Syriac version of the New Testament, called the Peshito, of about the same date and to a great extent agreeing with it. Tatian's Diatesseron, a Harmony of the Four Gospels, gives still earlier evidence of the authoritative Canon of the Gospels. (Cf. Irenæus Adv. Hær. III, 11, showing how and why there can be only Four Gospels.)

The Old Testament Canon was naturally regarded as already completed. Melito of Sardis, 170 A.D., after a travel of special research drew up a list of Old Testament Scriptures corresponding with our present Canon, omitting the Book of Esther.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Westcott, B. F.— General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament. 7th ed. Lond., 1896.

Sanday, W.—The Gospels in the Second Century. Lond., 1876.

Sanday, W.—Inspiration, Early History and Origin, etc. Lond., 1896.

Bennett, W. H. and Adeney, W. F.—Biblical Introduction. Lond., 1899.

Wordsworth, Christopher.—The Canon of Scripture. 2nd ed. Lond., 1851.

Swainson, C. A.—The Authority of the New Testament. Lond., 1875.

Davidson, S.—The Canon of the Bible.

Charteris, A. H.—Canonicity. Lond., 1880.

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. Vol. II, pp. 38-67.

Moffat, J.,—The Historical New Testament. 2nd ed. Edinb., 1901.

von Soden, H.—History of Early Christian Literature. The Books of the New Testament. Crown Theol. Lib.. Vol. XIII. N. Y., 1906.

Stanton, V. H.—The Gospels as Historical Documents. Camb., 1903.

Bacon, B. W.—Introduction to the New Testament. N. Y., 1900.

Gregory, C. R.—Canon and Text of the New Testament. N. Y., 1907.

Weiss, B.—Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. 2 vols. N. Y., 1896.

Salmon, George.—Introduction to the New Testament. 6th ed. Lond., 1892.

§12. Baptism

Baptism was the sign and seal of union with Christ and His Church, the first and fundamental sacrament. It was adopted from the Jewish Church where it was used for the admission of proselytes, and was analogous to similar rites used for initiation into the mysteries and religious systems of the day. An authoritative account is given in the Didache: "But concerning Baptism, baptize thus: having said beforehand all these things (facts, faith and moral teaching of the Gospel) baptize ye in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in

living water. But if thou hast not living water, baptize in the other water, and if thou canst not in cold then in warm. But if thou hast not either, pour water thrice upon the head, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The service was very solemn and abounded in beautiful symbolism. At first, usually administered by the bishop, though allowed to priests and deacons, and completed by the anointing with oil and imposition of hands. The latter rite, being reserved for the bishop, soon became a separate rite,—Confirmation.

Infant baptism existed probably from the first. Jews baptized infant proselytes, and it is not condemned nor forbidden in the New Testament. It is implied by Jesus, by St. Paul and by the accounts in Acts. It is maintained by Irenæus Adv. Hær. ii, 22: 4; ii: 39. It is opposed, as already existing, by Tertullian, De Bapt. 18 and 20. Origen regarded it as an immemorial custom. See also Cyprian, Epistle 57 (Oxford 64).

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Wall, W.—History of Infant Baptism. 4 vols. Oxford, 1836.
Wilberforce.—Holy Baptism. Lond., 1849.
Hooker, Richard.—Ecclesiastical Polity. Book V, Sections 58 to 65.
Mozley, J. B.—Review of the Baptismal Controversy. 2nd ed. Lond., 1883.
Sadler, M. F.—The Sacrament of Responsibility. 5th ed. Lond., 1886.
Malan, S. C.—The Two Holy Sacraments. Lond., 1881.
Stone, Darwell.—Holy Baptism. Oxford Library of Practical Theology. Lond., 1899.
Rogers, C. F.—Early History of Baptism. Oxford, 1903.

§13. The Eucharist

From the beginning Christians assembled together for worship, instruction and strength, for union and service. These objects were preëminently gained in the Lord's Supper (the Holy Eucharist or the Holy Communion), to which only the faithful baptized were admitted. The earliest accounts, outside of the New Testament, are given in the Didache, 9, 10 and 14; Pliny's Letter to Trajan; Justin Martyr's Apology I, 65-67; Irenæus, Fragment 38; Adv. Hær. iv: 18. v: 2; 2, 3; Tert. Apol. 30, 31, 39; Orig. Adv. Cel., Bk. viii.

In primitive times the bread and wine were blessed and received at the household meal (Acts ii: 46, or at a more general one, I Cor. xi: 20). Often in connection with the Agape (Acts vi: 2; Jude 12; Tert. Apol. 39), but afterwards as a separate service; at first in the evening and later at early dawn, (Pliny Ep. 96); Tert. ad Uxor. ii: 4; De Corona Mil. 3; Cypr. Ep. 62 (Oxford 63), always every Sunday. The bishop, or a presbyter authorized by him, administered and the other presbyters and deacons assisted. The bread and wine were voluntary gifts of the faithful and were called Oblations.

The bread was leavened bread; the wine, usually white as being purer, was mixed with water. After the services the deacons carried what was left to the sick and imprisoned. In many places a portion of the consecrated bread was taken home and eaten at

the morning prayer for the consecration of a new day. From the earliest times the Body and Blood were associated with the Bread and Wine. (I Cor. x: 16.)

The Lord's Supper was regarded as a supremely holy mystery, a spiritual food indispensable to eternal life; so that the body and blood of the Lord entered into some mystical connection with the bread and wine, and placed the faithful partaker of them in true and essential fellowship with Christ.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Hooker.—Ecclesiastical Polity. Book V, Section 67.

Cheetham, S.—The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian. Lond., 1897.

Hatch, Edwin.—Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. Hibbert Lectures, 1888. 2nd ed. Lond., 1891.

§14. Festivals and Holy Days

Sunday, the first day of the week, called the Lord's Day, was kept from the first Easter Day, as a day of joy and special service. Prayer was said standing, and fasting was prohibited. It is a mistake to call this day the Sabbath Day, which was the seventh or day before, and was quite differently observed by Christians.

Wednesday (the day of the betrayal and condemnation), Friday (the day of the Crucifixion), were days of spiritual service and remembrance, called Watch Days, or Days of Stations. The only annual celebrations were Easter and Pentecost. Another class of yearly festi-

vals arose from the annual commemorations of Saints and Martyrs, on the day of their death, called their birthday.

A controversy arose regarding the time for the observance of Easter, called the Paschal Controversy. As our Lord was crucified and rose again at the Passover season, this festival became to the Christians the time for commemorating the Crucifixion and Resurrection; but as to the day of its observance there were three different practices in the second century. Two of them were based on the apparent difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. According to the Synoptics, Jesus celebrated the Passover with His disciples on the Passover day itself, the 14th Nisan, was crucified on the following day, the 15th Nisan, and rose on the third day, the 17th Nisan. In accordance with these statements the Ebionite Jewish Christians kept the Paschal feast on the 14th Nisan as did the Jews, claiming that Christ did the same; thus ending their fast on the 14th Nisan, no matter on what day of the week it fell.

But according to St. John's Gospel, identifying Jesus with the Paschal lamb, the last Supper was instituted on the 13th Nisan, the day before the Passover, and Jesus was crucified on the 14th, the very day the lamb was slain for the Paschal feast. In accordance with this interpretation the Catholic Jewish Christians of Asia Minor, claiming to follow the precepts and, as Polycarp declared, the practice of St. John, commemorated the Crucifixion on the

14th Nisan, and the Resurrection on the 16th, irrespective of the day of the week on which it might fall; also ending their fast on the afternoon of the 14th with the Agape and Lord's Supper as the Passover celebrating the Crucifixion. On this account they were known as Quartodecimans. Of course where either of these forms was observed much confusion was caused in the Paschal week; for Friday was regularly kept every week as the day of the Crucifixion, and Sunday as the weekly memorial of the Resurrection.

A third practice, therefore, obtained in the Gentile Churches of the West, as also in Egypt, Palestine, Pontus and Greece, which sought to harmonize the annual with the weekly celebration, and disregarded the Jewish celebration altogether, except as determining the season. In accordance with this practice the first Friday after the 14th Nisan was kept as the anniversary of the Crucifixion and the Sunday after as Easter Day. The fasting was continued till the dawn of Easter and ended with the Eucharist on Easter morning. This was called the Dominical or Sunday use. These two uses (disregarding the Ebionites who were admittedly heretics) went on without conflict until the well-known visit of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, to Rome 154 A.D. The Roman Bishop Anicetus referred to the tradition of the Roman Church; Polycarp appealed to the authority of St. John, declaring that he himself had actually celebrated the Paschal festival with St. John accord-

ing to the practice still continued in Asia Minor. Neither could convince the other, but the two bishops parted in peace. (Euseb. H. E. v: 24.)

The Ebionite practice caused a lively controversy in the Church in Asia Minor about 167 A.D. in which the two famous apologists, Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, and Melito of Sardis, took part.

The controversy broke out again in Rome at the end of the century, when Victor was bishop. Wishing to have the question decided he asked Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, to call the other bishops of Asia to a synod, but they adhered to their old custom. Victor then issued a letter renouncing communion with them, but Irenæus and others remonstrated and he withdrew it. The Churches of Asia finally adopted the Dominical use and by the fourth century it had ceased to be a matter of dispute. In order to determine which Sunday should be celebrated, various cycles were used.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Butcher, S.—The Ecclesiastical Calendar.

For §§ 12, 13 and 14 see Bingham's Antiquities, Articles in Dictionaries and Encyclopædias, especially Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, and the books of A. V. G. Allen and of A. P. Stanley on Christian Institutions.

§15. Christian Life and Discipline

With the development of the Christian Organization and Creed, there went on also a development of definite regulations of life, evidenced in a purifying

influence, in reaction against the corruption of the over-refined luxurious and sensuous Greek and Roman culture. This showed itself first, of course, in the individual, but particularly in the family, and in the new standards set up by the Church. In the ancient world morality had never been associated with religion, which signified only the ceremonial worship of the gods, except so far as this worship was connected with certain ascetic practices. Morals were associated with philosophy, which sought to elevate the taste, raise the standard and provide the incentive for a moral life. Yet even here the motives were expediency and moderation rather than principle and conscience. With the authoritative declaration of immortality, of the spiritual unity and holy personality of God, of the reality and supreme importance of the spiritual personality of man, manifested in the revelation in Jesus Christ, Christianity brought into the world a hope, an inspiration, a power and a meaning of life and a sense of its reality unknown before and but dimly foreshadowed in Judaism. All this at once separated the Christians from the rest of the world. They were in it but not of it. They were serious while much of the world around them was frivolous. The life of the world was so permeated and degraded by heathen idolatry and immorality that it was incompatible with a life devoted to Christian standards. The Christians were thus cut off from all the amusements, from much of the business, civil and military life, and from a great deal of the social

life, as well as from the art and literature of the world around them.

But their life was not merely negative. With the new hope and new meaning for life there came a new spirit with new aims and purposes. This was most evident in the family life. Children were a precious trust and their maintenance was the training of immortal souls. Marriage was a consecrated and holy relationship, its bond a pure and divine love, a life-long union, indissoluble except by death and in the one case of adultery. Indeed, in the view of some, even death did not dissolve it, and a second marriage was regarded as a sin, and in the second century directly forbidden to the clergy. In spite of the high place accorded to Christian marriage, however, the unmarried state was regarded as higher, and doubts were early raised as to whether marriage should be permitted to the clergy.

Among the Christians, brotherly love was the principle and inspiration of every activity. This showed itself from the beginning toward the helpless and needy. The poor, the sick, the aged, widows and orphans, strangers, and those in prison or in captivity, were the objects of special attention and relief. This practical care, reaching far beyond the local community, testified to the unity of the Catholic Church, and extending even beyond the circle of believers, gave evidence of a divine charity. The consciousness of separation from and reaction against the pagan world expressed itself in an increasing tendency to-

ward asceticism, an extreme form of self-denial which was not confined to Christianity; a form of protest manifested in many religions and ages.

Ascetics, individually at first, withdrew as far as might be from the world and devoted themselves to prayer and holy meditation, living on a scanty diet and abstaining from marriage. Already in the second century we find both men and women devoting themselves to celibacy, forming a distinct order in the Church, though not bound by life-long vows. The apologist Tatian was a leader of those who from their severe self-denial were called Encratites.

We have noted already the asceticism of the Montanists and of some of the Gnostic sects.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Uhlhorn, Gerhard.—Christian Charity in the Ancient Church. Esp. pp. 99-215. N. Y., 1883.

Harnack, A.—Mission and Expansion. II, pp. 147-198.

Schmidt, C.—Social Results of Early Christianity. Trans. Lond., 1885.

Marshall, N.—Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church. Lond., 1714.

Lea, H. C.—Studies in Church History. pp. 235-287.

§16. The Intellectual Attack

Christianity in this period was brought within the notice of the writers of the age. Spiteful and contemptuous flings are found in the writings of Tacitus, Pliny, Marcus Aurelius, Galen, the rhetorician Fronto, and the cynic Crescens; while caricatures, in word and picture, represented them as worshippers

of the ass, a term of contempt originally applied to the Jews.

This ridicule and satire reached its height in the work of Lucian of Samosata, who has been called the Voltaire of the second century. It is entitled "The Death of Peregrinus."

But the serious and really intellectual attack upon Christianity was made by Celsus; modern ingenuity has done little more than elaborate the arguments of the ancient rhetorician. His book, called "The True Word," is known to us only from the reply of Origen; but as that reply quotes the exact words and takes them up point by point, the original work of Celsus has been completely reproduced.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Fowler, H. W. and F. G.—The Works of Lucian. 4 vols. 1905.

Jebb, R. C.—Essays and Addresses. Lucian. Lond., 1907.

Harnack, A.—Mission and Expansion. I, pp. 188 ff.

Collins, W. L.—Lucian. Edinb., 1873.

Bigg, Charles.—Christian Platonists. pp. 253-268.

A. CHAPTER III.

THE OLD CATHOLIC AGE

180 A.D. TO 313 A.D.

§1. The Spread of Christianity

THE Church had now reached the full measure of its ecclesiastical organization with the definite establishment of its simple Rule of Faith, the authoritative canon of its accepted Christian writings, defended and assured by the authority of the Bishop at the head of each community of believers as the centre of unity, order and authority; and still further strengthened by the confederation and agreement of the Bishops, by Synods and by the larger influence and importance of the great Apostolic Sees, Antioch, Alexandria and Rome, and, of hardly less importance, Carthage, Cæsarea and Ephesus.

This entrance into the world as a great world institution carried with it certain modifications of the strict requirements on the life of believers, achieved, however, amid vehement struggles. Consequently the Church of the third century entered upon a greatly increased activity and growth. Persia, India and Armenia were formally added to the domain of the Christian Church, while Asia Minor, Arabia, North Africa and Spain witnessed its even wider growth and more firmly established extension. Many new communities were formed in Gaul. There is evidence

of at least three bishoprics in Britain: York, London, and probably Lincoln.

Christianity came also into the Roman provinces on the Danube, in the train of Roman dominion and civilization, to the towns and fixed quarters of the Roman legions, brougnt by soldiers, workmen and merchants. In Rhætia, we have Augsburg, Regensburg (or Ratisbon) and Passau; in Noricum, Lorch and Pettau; in Pannonia, Sirmium. It became still more strongly established in the Rhine provinces, in the chief centres of Roman dominion; where Treves, Mainz, Worms, Speyer, Strassburg, Basle and Cologne are the most important.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Gardiner, Percy.—The Growth of Christianity. Lond., 1907.

Harnack, A.—Mission and Expansion. II, pp. 96-306.

Orr, James.—Some Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity. N. Y., 1899.

Spence, H. D. M.—Early Christianity and Paganism. N. Y., 1902.

§2. The Church and the Empire; The Persecutions

For about seventy years after Marcus Aurelius, that is, two generations (from 180 A.D. to 249 A.D.) a period covered by seventeen emperors, there was very little persecution, and that fitful and local. Many of the emperors were weak and contemptible, caring no more for the spread of Christianity than they did for any of the larger concerns of the Empire. There

were two exceptions. Septimius Severus, 202 A.D., issued a rescript forbidding *collegia illicita* and all conversions to Christianity. In the provinces the persecutions based on the judicial decisions became very severe. In Alexandria, Origen's father, Leonidas, and others suffered; in North Africa, Perpetua and Felicitas, and others whose names have come down to us. Under the next emperor, Caracalla, 211 A.D., the persecutions gradually ceased. Alexander Severus (225-235 A.D.) set up statues of Apollonius, Jesus, Abraham and Orpheus in his private chapel, although Christianity was not acknowledged; and his successor, Maximin the Thracian (235-238 A.D.) commanded that the clergy should be put to death as the real causes of the spread of the Gospel; but the edict was not carried out.

Up to this point Christians were indeed always legally in danger and exposed to popular passion and prejudice, but proceedings against them had always been fitful and sporadic, never systematic and general; consequently the number of Christians greatly increased, and their attitude became more confident and assured. The strongly organized and growing Christian Church could no longer be ignored by a statesmanlike emperor, nor opposed by occasional attacks. The time had come for a life and death struggle. Under Decius (249-251 A.D.) we have the edict of 250 A.D., the first systematically conceived measure aimed against Christians throughout the Empire. All Christians were ordered to perform the Roman state

religious ceremonies before a certain day, torture and death were the penalites for refusal, and every effort was made to force the Christians to apostatize. After such a long period of security the effect was staggering and many yielded. Different names were given to the various classes of the "lapsed"—*sacrificati*, those who had performed sacrifice; *thurificati*, those who had burned incense; and *libellatici*, those who had received certificates of worship either by the act itself, or for a money payment, which the Church regarded as especially reprehensible and unworthy. Many fell; but a deeper love and fellowship, a nobler courage and a larger enthusiasm and zeal were the first results. As Tertullian expressed it, "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." It aroused the conscience of the Christians and attracted more general attention to them. From that time their progress was even more rapid, and they became more active and conspicuous.

After the martyrdom of Fabian, Bishop of Rome, early in 250, the see remained vacant for over fifteen months, until the death of Decius, who declared he would rather have a rival emperor at his side than a bishop at Rome.

Then persecution ceased; but Valerian (253-260 A.D.) was led by public disasters and the advice of his friends to renew the attack, which he did in an edict issued 257 A.D., banishing the bishops and forbidding the assembling of Christians. The next year he issued another edict even more severe than

that of Decius; condemning all bishops, priests, and deacons to death. Cyprian of Carthage, who, for the sake of his Church had escaped from the persecution of Decius, returned and gained a martyr's crown under Valerian. The death of Valerian ended this most sanguinary persecution, and Gallienus (260-268 A.D.) recalled the exiles and restored their property; but Aurelius (270-275 A.D.) ordered the old laws enforced with renewed vigor. His death however prevented the execution of the order and the Christians had another generation (about forty years) of peace.

Under Diocletian (284-305 A.D.), one of the greatest and most statesmanlike of all the emperors, began the last, longest and severest persecution. Mildest in the West, and most severe in Syria and Egypt, it lasted eight long, terrible years. He took up the struggle reluctantly; but it began 303 A.D. and lasted till 311 A.D., being continued in the East by Galerius and Maximin after the abdication of Diocletian, 305 A.D. Various edicts in quick succession ordered all soldiers to take part in the sacrifices, churches to be razed to the ground, the Scriptures to be burned, Christian officials degraded, Christian servants enslaved, bishops imprisoned and forced to sacrifice, and the severest tortures employed to compel Christians to conform. Everywhere except in the West these laws were executed with great severity, until checked by the edict of limited toleration issued by Galerius on his death-bed, and signed by his co-regents Constantine and Licinius, and probably by Maxentius, 311

A.D., and finally stopped by the decree of complete toleration which was granted by Constantine and Licinius, the only remaining emperors, in the famous Edict of Milan, 313 A.D., after a glorious struggle of 250 years.

The results of the persecutions may be briefly summarized:

1. Increased growth and influence of Christianity.

2. Organization of the Church strengthened and unified. The extraordinary development of the power of the Bishops of Rome was greatly influenced. Christianity was adopted by the Empire; but also, for weal or woe, the Empire was adopted by Christianity.

3. The Church was kept purer in belief and practice, and more united in form; also tending to the conspicuous leadership of the Roman Church.

4. It produced a group of extraordinary literary defenders, who helped to develop the fundamental orthodox Christian doctrine.

5. The forms of worship were modified; veneration of saints and martyrs and of their relics originated; and the priesthood was sanctified and set above the laity. The bishops, singled out by the edicts of the persecuting emperors, were raised to a still higher rank in the respect and obedience of the faithful.

Constantine, the hero of this great victory, was born about 274 A.D. in upper Moesia. His father was Constantius Chlorus, nephew of the Emperor Claudius Gothicus, and Cæsar of the West under Diocle-

tian. His mother was Helena, an innkeeper's daughter. He is said to have learned Christianity from his mother, and early followed his father's policy of toleration toward the Christians in the West. Diocletian himself, down to 303 A.D., was not unfavorable to Christianity, both his wife and daughter being Christians, and it was only two years after the persecution began that he resigned. Whether his disapproval of the persecuting policy of Maximin and Galerius had anything to do with his resignation is not known. Constantius, who ruled over Britain, Gaul and Spain, was tolerant toward the Christians; and his Cæsar, Severus, did not show any great zeal for persecuting in Italy and Africa, so that there was little persecution in the West after the first two years (303-305 A.D.). When Constantius died, 306 A.D., the soldiers proclaimed his son Constantine as Augustus, to succeed him. Thus Diocletian's scheme of two Augusti and two Cæsars broke down; and indeed at one time there were six claimants to the title of Augustus. After the edict of Galerius and his death, 311 A.D., Maximin joined by Maxentius continued the persecution of the Christians in the East, and endeavored to form an organized pagan Church with an official hierarchy. This inclined their rivals to take up the cause of the Christians.

Constantine, therefore, claimed their support in the West against Maxentius who was preparing to invade Gaul. On the march against Maxentius, with Christian bishops in his retinue, he saw, he declared

in the western sky, above the setting sun, a fiery cross with the phrase τούτῳ νίκα; and said that in a dream the following night Christ Himself appeared and ordered him to take the emblem as a standard of defence against his enemies. Thereupon he took the monogram of Christ, *XP*, with the cross for his banner or *labarum;* summoned the Christians to his service; and, protected by the cross, went forward against Maxentius whom he defeated at the battle of Milvian Bridge, October 27, 312 A.D. The story has been variously interpreted; but the standard and the victory under it are facts of history. The sign became the emblem of Constantine, on his helmet, on the shields of his soldiers, on the banners of his armies and on his coins (though sometimes with heathen emblems on the reverse). From this time the restoration of imperial unity and the triumph of Christianity advanced side by side.

Constantine, victor in the West, now joined with Licinius the victor in the East, and, 313 A.D., issued the famous Edict of Milan, which for the first time conferred a legal status upon Christianity. This edict went far beyond that of 311; which only stopped the persecutions, but without allowing any one to leave his own religion and join another. After 313 A.D. people could and did openly desert the old religion and profess the new faith; indeed, later, Constantine publicly exhorted all his subjects to worship the God of the Christians. Christianity was put on an equality with paganism, an opportunity was given for public organi-

zation, and the Church was legalized as a corporation capable of receiving legacies and administering property. All Church property confiscated during the persecutions was restored. It is important to notice that this edict did not establish Christianity as the State religion; did not give it a corporate existence for the first time, but gave it all the privileges which the pagan religion enjoyed, and enabled it to take rank as a privileged cult, subsidized by the State. Instead of a tacit tolerance it now had a legal title.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Workman, H. B.—Persecutions in the Early Church. Lond., 1906.

Gregg, J. A. F.—The Decian Persecution. Lond., 1897.

Healy, P. J.—The Valerian Persecution. N. Y., 1905.

Mason, A. J.—The Persecution of Diocletian. Camb., 1876.

Mason, A. J.—Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church. Lond., 1905.

Uhlhorn, G.—Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. Trans. N. Y., 1879.

Holmes, T. Scott.—The Christian Church in Gaul.

Lecky, W. E. H.—History of European Morals. pp. 395-468. N. Y., 1895.

University of Pennsylvania.—Translations and Reprints. Vol. IV., No. 1. Phil., 1898.

§3. Theological Schools and Tendencies

Just as we mark a note of difference in going from the authoritative, interpretative writings of the New Testament in the first century to the hortatory, expository writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and from them to the apologetic and polemic writings of the

Post-Apostolic Age in the second century, so we mark another step in the development of the Church's thought, in passing to the more scientific and comprehensive theological writings of the Old Catholic Age in the third century, leading up to, and preparing for the Nicene period in the fourth century. While these developments were in progress, there arose within the Catholic Church four different theological schools of thought, each with a special and important characteristic of its own:—the Asiatic, the Alexandrian, the Antiochian, and the North African.

Asia Minor deserves a volume by itself. Nowhere was there greater religious activity than in the Syrian home of Christianity and in the neighboring Asia Minor. It was the scene of St. Paul's earliest missions. The earliest evidences of ecclesiastical organization and the earliest heresies are found there. It was there that the Jewish converts clung most tenaciously to their ancient rites, and the anticipation of the millenial reign of Christ on earth was most deeply rooted and took on its most fantastic forms. There also Montanism found its earliest followers. It was the home of St. John, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias and Irenæus. Irenæus was a pupil of Polycarp and a native of Asia Minor, born in the first quarter of the second century. He is of the greatest importance as a representative of the ecclesiastical positions which were then becoming most prominent. His connection with the earlier Church and traditions of the Post-Apostolic Age made him a wise medium

of transition from that age to the next. Renan calls him the model of the complete ecclesiastic. Learned, orthodox and able, he stands out as one of the most important and most impressive figures of the second century. He spoke with authority as the direct representative of the school of St. John. In the Easter controversy, when Victor, Bishop of Rome, tried to cut off the Asiatic Church for holding to the Quartodeciman position, Irenæus intervened and persuaded Victor to relent. He was one of that early band of Christians who went from Asia Minor to Southern Gaul, where he became a presbyter at Lyons. In this capacity he brought to Bishop Eleutherus of Rome the letter from the martyrs in their prison, expressing the sympathy they felt for the Montanists as their fellow-countrymen, and thus he escaped the executions which followed, 177 A.D. Bishop Pothinus of Lyons was martyred, and Irenæus on his return from Rome succeeded him as Bishop. His visit to Rome brought him into contact with Gnosticism, particularly the Valentinian system. His work against the Gnostics, in five books, written between 182 and 188 A.D., is of the greatest historical value, as he had a thorough knowledge of their various systems. In the third book, which is of special importance, he gives a concise summary of the uniform teaching of the Church (one of the earliest forms of the Rule of Faith) and attaches the highest importance to tradition, which is verified and confirmed by the suc-

cession of bishops and presbyters, reaching back to the Apostles in the various Churches, among which he cites as the most conspicuous and accessible, the Churches of Rome and of Asia. This guaranteed tradition he uses as the most effective weapon against the false tradition of his opponents. Thus the appeal to tradition antedates the appeal to reason and argument. When and how he died is uncertain; the earliest tradition being that of Gregory of Tours, (d. 595 A.D.), who states that he was martyred 202 A.D. under Septimius Severus.

Hippolytus of Rome was his disciple and continued his work. He was a presbyter at Rome under Bishops Zephyrinus (202-217 A.D.), and Callistus (217-222 A.D.), whose too easy readmission of penitents he strenuously opposed. In the controversy which Hippolytus had with the Patripassian Sabellius and the Noetians, the Roman bishops, especially Callistus, tried to reconcile the two by a statement which indeed later developed into the true Athanasian position, but resulted in Hippolytus calling the bishop a Noetian, while the Noetians denounced him as a Dytheist. Both Hippolytus and Sabellius were excommunicated. It was then, probably, that Hippolytus was chosen by his followers as their bishop in opposition to Callistus. United with the Roman Bishop Pontianus in a common banishment to the mines of Sardinia (235 A.D.), a reconciliation took place. In death they were not divided, and both were honored as martyrs by the Roman Church. A statue had been

erected to him as Bishop of Portus, probably 222 A.D. (at the beginning of his schism), discovered 1551 A.D., representing him as seated on an episcopal throne, on the back of which is a list of his writings and the sixteen-year Easter Cycle which he arranged. He is often compared with Origen. Indeed his greatest work, "Philosophoumena, or Refutation of all Heresies," was formerly ascribed to Origen. It is based on Irenæus, but gives fuller knowledge concerning the different Gnostic systems and shows their relation to pagan philosophy. But he was more of a scholar than a thinker, and of first rank as an exegete. Forty or fifty writings of various kinds were ascribed to him. He was one of the last of Roman scholars who wrote in Greek.

A catechetical school was established early at Alexandria under the supervision of the bishop, at first to prepare heathen and Jews for baptism. From this, under the philosophical influences of the city, it grew into a sort of theological seminary. The first head of the school was Pantænus, of whom little more than his name has come down to us. He died 202 A.D. (Euseb. H. E., V, 10, 11; VI, 3, 4, 9.) His convert, pupil and successor was Clement of Alexandria (Titus Flavius Clemens). On his travels, undertaken in the search for knowledge, he came to Alexandria as a learned pagan philosopher. Here he found that the wisdom of Greece was not condemned nor treated with indifference, but regarded as a preparatory light from the Divine Logos adored by

Christians in Jesus Christ. He became a Christian and succeeded Pantænus as head of the school at Alexandria. His chief writings are: "The Protreptic or Exhortation to the Greeks," which seeks to prepare the minds of the heathen for Christianity by proving the vanity of heathenism; "The Pedagogue," in three books, an introduction to the Christian life; "The Stromata or Miscellanies," in eight books, setting forth the deeper thought of a true Christian Gnosis, which by its learning and nobility undermined the influence of Gnosticism. Also a little tract, "Who is the Rich Man who will be Saved?" Another important work which is lost entitled "Hypotyposes," in eight books, was an expository review of the contents of the Scriptures. He died c. 215 A.D.

Great as Clement was as a thinker and scholar, he was far surpassed by Origen, who was regarded by his pagan and Christian contemporaries as a miracle of scholarship. He was celebrated as a philosopher, philologist, critic, exegete, dogmatist, apologist, the founder of a scientific theology and the originator of many heresies. He was born in Alexandria 185 A.D., and brought up as a Christian. His father, Leonidas, was his first teacher, and became a martyr 202 A.D. Many of the early Christian scholars, like Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, had passed from pagan philosophy to the Christian faith; their education had been first philosophical and then religious. Origen followed the reverse order. Realizing that he

must understand the teaching which he had to oppose, he entered upon the study of Greek philosophy. His biography is a romance: he lived through self-mutilation, persecution, torture and the rack, poverty and hard labor; and died at Tyre 253 A.D., as the result of his sufferings in the Decian persecution. At the age of eighteen he succeeded Clement as head of the school at Alexandria, though he was not ordained until twenty-five years afterward at Cæsarea, 228 A.D. His writings were estimated at from two to six thousand titles, of which only a few remain. One of his greatest works was the "Hexapla," or six-fold Old Testament; giving the Hebrew text in Hebrew and in Greek characters, the Septuagint and three other Greek versions. It disappeared during or after the fourth century. (See Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Chap. III.) Origen's two great works, "First Principles" (the first treatise on systematic theology), and "Against Celsus," have come down to us.

Dionysius Alexandrinus was the most celebrated successor of Origen, and his convert and pupil. He was head of the catechetical school 232 A.D., and became Bishop of Alexandria 247 A.D. He died 265 A.D. Only fragments of his writings are preserved.

Gregory Thaumaturgus was another of Origen's converts and pupils; he was Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, and died 270 A.D. Pamphilius, the friend of Eusebius, and a learned presbyter of Cæsarea, also belongs to this group.

We may mention here other Greek-speaking Church teachers of this period. Hegesippus, a Judaic Christian, is sometimes called the Father of Church History; although the fragments we have are rather fabulous and not arranged in chronological order. Caius of Rome, about 210 A.D., was one of the most conspicuous opponents of Montanism. Sextus Julius Africanus, a native of Palestine, died about 240 A.D. His lost work on Chronography, a history of the world from the creation, was used as a manual of history during the Middle Ages; from it Eusebius derived his lists of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. Fragments have come down to us; and also, in full, a dialogue, "The Symposium of the Ten Virgins."

The Antiochian school marked another distinct tendency in theological thought; being characterized by literal and grammatical exactness of interpretation and thought. Antioch was the greatest of the Greek towns where the Greek spirit still retained its ascendancy. It succeded Jerusalem as the chief metropolis of Christendom, and a catechetical school seems to have developed there, as at Alexandria; but after Hadrian's time, the Church at Antioch is lost to sight. Enthusiasm for Bible study was kept up at Antioch; and with a more sober and historical mode of interpretation than at Alexandria, where the allegorical method prevailed. The earliest writer was Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, who wrote a "Defense of Christianity" addressed to Autolycus, and also a work against Hermogenes. The latter seems to have been

incorporated in Tertullian's work on the same subject. He also wrote a book on the history of the world, and thus anticipated Julius Africanus and Hippolytus. Dorotheus and Lucian were the chief exponents of the school in the third century. Dorotheus, who died about 290 A.D., was a man of liberal mind, of Greek culture and able to read the Hebrew Old Testament. Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, died a martyr 312 A.D. He was a man of upright and active life, well disciplined in sacred learning, making a critical revision of the text of the Old and New Testaments. Among his disciples were Arius and many other leaders in the Arian movement. Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa, who died 360 A.D., Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, his pupil, who died 394 A.D., and John Chrysostom, the pupil of Diodorus, raised to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and died in exile 407 A.D.,—these three formed the strength and established the reputation of the school at Antioch in the last half of the fourth century. They were noted for their exegetical studies; following the plain grammatical sense of the Scriptures, and illustrating the principles of the school.

Strange to say, the school of Latin Church writers began not in Rome but in North Africa. The Roman Church was at first "a Greek religious colony." The source of the Christianity of North Africa is not known, though it was probably Rome, as the connection between the two was very close. The first great writer in this school was Ter-

tullian — Quintus Septimius Florens — son of a heathen centurion of Carthage; born between 150 and 160 A.D., a distinguished advocate (or attorney), converted when about thirty or forty years old and became a presbyter (probably in Carthage); died at Carthage 220 A.D., or later. His mind, essentially legal and fanatical, carried him finally, on account of his asceticism and puritanical nature, over to the Montanists, whom he joined about 202 A.D. He began to write in Greek but later changed to Latin. His writings are of great historical importance as well as of theological interest. The Octavius by Minucius Felix may be earlier; but Tertullian has been rightly recognized as the actual creator of ecclesiastical Latin. His writings may be divided into three groups:

1. Apologetic — against Jews and Pagans.
2. Theological — against Heretics.
3. Ethical and Ascetic writings.

Another division makes one group of those written before, and another of those written after, he became a Montanist; but this is not easily determined in every case. His book, "Prescription of Heretics," is almost a Catholic textbook; and, indeed, he became the father of distinctly Western Catholicism. The Western spirit showed itself in his predominating practical tendency, more ethical and formal. The Alexandrians were more speculative and mystical in the freer style of the East. They were not so polemic and apologetic, but more intent upon the expression of the inner spiritual and scientific truth of Chris-

tianity, rather than upon its development as a system to be formulated and defended. Indeed, Christian theological science in the highest sense of the phrase began in Alexandria, where we find the appropriation of the complete result of previous culture and its blending with the Christian point of view. Jurisprudence in Carthage and philosophy in Alexandria entered into Christianity.

Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus was born of a wealthy family in Carthage, and while a young man attained social eminence and great popularity as a teacher of rhetoric and an expert lawyer. Suddenly he renounced his wealth, his profession and all secular literature, and devoted himself to the Bible alone; having been converted to Christianity by Cæcilius, a presbyter of Carthage; and was baptized 246 A.D. Soon afterward he was ordained; and, about 248 A.D., was raised to the bishopric of Carthage by the almost unanimous vote of the clergy and the free choice of the people. Five presbyters opposed his election and remained in active antagonism to him. At the outbreak of the Decian persecution, 250 A.D., Cyprian left the city, but returned after a year's absence. His epoch-making significance may be seen in his successful struggle for the greater unity in the Church, and his contribution to the development of the Christian ministry into a hierarchical administrative order. The schism of Novatus and the relations with Rome are the most important events. His writings, comprising twelve treatises and eighty-

one epistles to meet practical issues, are of the very highest value as sources for the history of his time. He himself collected and preserved them with the greatest care, though they have come down to us with some interpolations. For two centuries they held a place next to the Scriptures. The treatises are on apologetics, dogmatics, ethics and Church polity. The most important are the one "To Donatus," written soon after this conversion, contrasting Christianity with paganism, and that "On the Unity of the Church."

When Cyprian returned to Carthage after a year's absence, he found the small party which had opposed his election now in rebellion against him, led by the presbyter Novatus, a disappointed candidate for the episcopate. His position was made doubly difficult by the attitude of the confessors, who claimed the right to allow the readmission to communion of those who had lapsed from the faith by conforming to paganism, and had appealed to them. This was subversive of discipline and episcopal authority. Novatus, with a deacon named Felicissimus, joined the confessors in the opposition. An African Synod (now a regular institution, held once or twice a year), upheld Cyprian; but later Felicissimus secured the election of Fortunatus as a rival bishop. Novatus withdrew to Rome after the death of Fabian, and there took a leading part in another schism under Novatian (a scholarly man and the first Latin writer in the Roman Church, the leader of the rigorist party

at Rome against the readmission of the lapsed), in some sense a continuation of the schism of Hippolytus, though not immediately following, and without its doctrinal features. Novatian was chosen as a rival bishop; the movement spread, and Novatianist churches, based on rigorous treatment of the lapsed, were formed in various parts of the Empire. They stood faithfully in defense of the Nicene Creed, and remnants of the party existed down to the sixth century. Connected with it was the Meletian schism in Egypt, where Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, a representative of the rigorist party, infringed upon the rights of the Bishop of Alexandria. He was excommunicated by a synod (306 A.D.), and gained a large following who later joined the Arians.

On several occasions the relations between Cyprian and the Church at Rome were somewhat strained. After the martyrdom of Fabian, letters had come from the presbyters at Rome reflecting on the conduct of Cyprian in evading persecution by leaving his city; but Cyprian succeeded in justifying his action. Cornelius, Fabian's successor, seemed inclined to favor the doubts cast upon Cyprian's right to occupy the see of Carthage; but harmony was soon restored. Later a real controversy arose with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, 254-257 A.D., with whose attitude toward some of the Novatianists Cyprian had little sympathy. The tradition and practice of the African Church generally had been to deny the validity of baptism by heretics or schismatics, even if performed in the

Name of the Trinity. This custom prevailed also in Alexandria, Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor; indeed had been wellnigh constant and universal. But Rome had held the opposite view; accepting such baptism as valid. The Novatians had revived the controversy, and Stephen renounced fellowship with Firmilian and the other bishops of Asia Minor. Stephen thus came into conflict with Cyprian, and the point of separation between them was almost reached. (See Ep. 72 to Jubian, and Ep. 73 to Pompeius.) Stephen intimated to the bishops of Africa that they must conform to his practice or he would have no further dealings with them. A similar ultimatum was sent to the Eastern bishops. In September, 256 A.D., eighty-seven bishops from all the African provinces assembled in Carthage under Cyprian's presidency. All voted against the validity of baptism by heretics. The martyrdom of Stephen in August, 257 A.D., relieved the tension. His successor restored harmony by dropping the whole question; each side holding to its own practice. The matter was finally settled at the Council of Arles 314 A.D., after which the Roman practice finally prevailed in all cases where the correct form of baptism was assured.

Under Valerian (254-259 A.D.) persecution broke out again in 257, and Cyprian was banished and beheaded in 258.

One other African writer flourished in the time of Cyprian; Commodian, the earliest representative of Christian Latin verse. He was born a pagan, and

was converted to Christianity by reading the Bible. He wrote in rhyming hexameters, in rather barbarous Latin, mostly apologetic; "Against the Gods of the Nations," and "Against Jews and Gentiles."

Between the persecution of Valerian and that of Diocletian, that is, during the last forty years of the third century, the history of the Church in the entire West is wholly lost to sight.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Maurice, F. D.—Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. 2 vols. Lond., 1873.

Bigg, Charles.—Christian Platonists of Alexandria. N. Y., 1886.

Allen, A. V. G.—Continuity of Christian Thought. pp. 16-129.

Burkitt, F. C.—Early Eastern Christianity. Lond., 1904.

Lloyd, Julius.—The North African Church.

Benson, E. W.—Cyprian: Life and Times and Work. Lond., 1897.

Fairweather, W.—Origen and Greek Patristic Theology. N. Y., 1901.

Bunsen. C. C. J.—Hippolytus and the Church of Rome. 2nd ed. Lond., 1880.

von Döllinger, J. J. I.—Hippolytus and Callistus. Edinb., 1876.

Taylor, W. E.—Hippolytus and the Christian Church. Lond., 1853

Wordsworth, Christopher.—St. Hippolytus. Lond., 1853.

§4. The Theology of the Church

The history of the formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity is one of the most interesting and important chapters in Church history, and will help more to the understanding of the doctrine itself than

many chapters of abstract theological speculation. While the apologists of the second century endeavored to give some intellectual form to the Christian belief, such as found expression in the Rule of Faith, Christian theology in its real sense had its origin in connection with and from the Gnostic movement. Just as the struggle with Marcion led to the realization of the importance of determining the Canon of Scripture, so the struggle with the Gnostics resulted in the beginning of scientific theology in the Church. Thus Hellenism supplanted Judaism in Christian thought. In this sense, Harnack, in his article on Valentinus in the Encyclopædia Britannica, calls him "the most important Christian theologian before Origen; as being the first man in Christendom who, for other than merely apologetic purposes, sought to fuse together the results of Greek philosophy with the substance of the Gospels, and regarded the manifestation of Jesus as the keystone in the great structure."

Alexandria was the birthplace and centre of theology in the second, third and fourth centuries. The first three centuries, however, are marked by the absence of any official, constructive establishment of ecclesiastical doctrine; for we do not find any organ of universal authority until we come to the establishment of the imperial Church and the œcumenical councils. The persecutions and the scattered condition of the Church allowed no opportunity for it. But step by step, as the various theories and inter-

pretations were brought forward, the Church's consciousness of the Faith fought its way to full and complete expression. As the Church extended and expanded a great variety of opinions and points of view developed. On the one hand were those who came from schools of philosophy and who labored in the centres of Greek culture, like Corinth and Alexandria; and on the other, those who were converted from Judaism, or who sought for converts among the more practical and less speculative peoples in Asia Minor, North Africa and Rome.

The first teachings were oral; and tradition filled a prominent place and played a most important part in the early development of doctrine and practice. Later the collected Christian writings were only added to tradition as another source of Christian teaching. The appeal to this formed the basis of Tertullian's "short and easy method with the heretics." But the importance of tradition shows the original meaning and value of the Apostolic Succession; justifying and confirming it as the necessary order of the Church.

The real problem of theology is the Personality of Jesus. Who was He? What was His relation to God? Logos, Wisdom, The Word, The Son of God, The One sent from God, were the answers; but what did these words mean? The Divinity of Jesus was as fixed as the Unity of God. But how to interpret and harmonize these two conceptions? The Ebionite idea of a deified man was a reaction to polytheism;

while the Docetic theory of Marcion and the Gnostics was a step back to Pantheism. The doctrine of the Logos was the basis and beginning of scientific theology. This conception is found in St. John's Gospel, and may be traced down through the early Apologists. It is interesting to note that Justin Martyr is the first Christian writer who uses the word Logos in the double sense of 'reason' and 'Word'; and Theophilus of Antioch, c. 180 A.D., is the first to use the term Trinity (Trias) when he makes the first three days of creation typical of the Trinity of God. The relation of the Son to the Father was variously interpreted; and Jesus was declared to be God's Son by incarnation or by adoption. These theories are ranged under several terms which must be clearly understood: (1) Hypostatianism (from hypostasis, substance), the personal and substantial existence of the Son, the pre-incarnate Christ. (2) Subordinationism, the subordinate existence of the Son, as a lower or derived form of being. Sometimes (1) and (2) were combined to indicate a theory of the personal distinction of the Son, yet subordinate in some respects to the Father; the tendency being to identify the proper essence of the Godhead with the Father, and to ascribe all the attributes of the Godhead to the Son, but not in a wholly equal measure. One form of expression placed God and Christ at one (Ignatius), without intending thereby to deny the true humanity of Jesus. Another recognized that in Him a higher, preëxistent heavenly Being had come in the flesh

(II Clement), without intending thereby to teach Dytheism. A third saw in Him a man in whom God had taken up his dwelling through His holy Christ-Spirit (Hermas), without intending thereby to oppose His divine honor. In consequence of the lack of abstract terminology these views tended to pass over into each other. The problem was brought to consciousness first by the heretical, then by the orthodox speculation. Thus the formularization of the different solutions was necessitated, so that they were brought into opposition to each other. The second of the above three expressions held its place by reason of the advancing philosophical conception of the Logos, and occupied the chief position among the theologians. The Apologists as well as the Anti-Gnostics and Alexandrians held, in different degrees, the conception of a divine self-unfolding; in which the Logos was considered a second potency, or hypostasis, proceeding from God and subordinate to Him. The attempt to give a separate place to the Holy Spirit also, raised the apprehension of the introduction of more Gods.

This led to (3) Monarchianism, the strict assertion of the solitary unity of God, as the single ruling principle. In connection with the doctrine of the Logos there were two distinct forms of this theory: (a) Dynamistic Monarchianism, regarding Christ as a man who had been endued in the fullest measure and to a supreme degree with divine wisdom and power; (b) Modal Monarchianism, asserting the fullness of

the Godhead in Christ, seeing in Him only a mode of the activity of the Father, or identifying the Father with the Logos (Patripassianism). Monarchianism in both of these forms, Dynamistic and Modal, was pronounced heretical by all the most illustrious fathers of the third century; and Hypostasianism was declared orthodox. There was latent, however, an element of error in the form of Subordinationism; and Modal Monarchianism approached very near to the doctrine of the Church, by adopting the doctrine of sameness of essence (homoousia), in Father and Son. The orthodox combination of the two was reached in the third century in Homoousian-hypostasianism; to which Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father led the way, and this finally attained universal acceptance in the fourth century. But all this was brought out and its full understanding and complete realization made possible only by discussions, conflicts and even heretical opposition, inadequate attempts at explanation and formulation, the course of which it is necessary to trace through the second and third centuries.

We note first the Alogians, who appeared in Asia Minor shortly after 170 A.D., and in opposition to the Montanists repudiated the sacred writings on which they based their doctrines of the Paraclete, visions, prophecies and the Second Coming. These writings were the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John. From this position they seemed to have been forced on to a denial of the Logos doctrine, which also rested

mainly on those two writings. Next in succession was Theodotus, called the Tanner, and said to have been a member of the sect of the Alogians. He went to Rome about 190 A.D., where he taught that Jesus was a man, born of the Virgin, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, in accordance with a divine decree. Jesus, he taught, grew up with a most pious and holy character, and upon him the Holy Ghost, the Christ spirit, came at his baptism; so he is called Christ, the Son of God. He could not be called God, at least until after his resurrection, which fact, as well as the virgin birth, was admitted; nor did he repudiate, openly at any rate, the writings of St. John, as the Alogians had done. He was followed by a second Theodotus, a banker or money changer, who, at Rome, about 210 A.D., founded a community called Melchizedekians, affirming that Melchizedek was more glorious than Christ, as the type or pattern is superior to the copy. They succeeded in getting a bishop, Natalis; but he soon repented at the feet of Zephyrinus, the Bishop of Rome. They were accused of following a strictly literal and grammatical exegesis, like that which characterized the Antiochian school, discarding the usual allegorical method. Their last exponent was Artemon, or Artemas, who lived possibly as late as 270 A D., and had some connection with Paul of Samosata. This seems to have been the beginning of the theory known as Dynamistic Monarchianism, and formed a connecting link with the early

Ebionism on account of the similarity of expressions used.

We turn now to the second form of the Monarchian doctrine, the Modal; which, admitting the divine personality of the Son and Holy Ghost, regarded them as modes or manifestations of one single divine personality. Instead of affirming that Jesus was endued with a divine power, they declared that he was the Father Himself, in a new form of activity. This is called the Patripassian theory; that the Father Himself became man and suffered on the cross. In its first crude form it was set forth by Praxeas, a confessor of Asia Minor, who appeared in Rome, and, unopposed, expounded his views. He supported and perhaps encouraged the Roman Bishop Victor in his condemnation of Montanism, and thus won Victor's approval of his Christological theory. This called forth Tertullian's famous remark, that "Praxeas in Rome performed two works of the devil; he had expelled prophecy and brought in heresy; he had driven away the Paraclete and crucified the Father." Probably, like the Alogians, Praxeas and his followers refused to admit the doctrine of the Logos into their Christology; fearing that in connection with the Hypostasian doctrine it would give an advantage to Gnosticism. The general teaching of the Church was not fully developed nor sharply defined; and it was in the very effort to give definiteness and consistency that these teachers labored to harmonize the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, the person of Christ, and the

activity of the Holy Spirit in one divine unity. The solution seemed to be in the Logos doctrine; yet Justin seems almost to say that the Logos is another God. The original Godhead was identified with the Father; and the Logos came into being as a free, temporal act of the divine will for the purpose of creation. This Logos then became incarnate in Jesus Christ. This was Hypostasianism; but it also involved an element of subordination, and made a distinction not merely in the divine being but in the divine attributes. Hippolytus in Rome and Tertullian in Africa both emphasized the Logos in opposition to the Theodotians and to Praxeas. Tertullian carried the doctrine a step further by what he called the three stages of filiation: (1) the eternal immanent state of being of the Son in the Father; (2) the forthcoming of the Son, taking his place at the side of the Father for creation; (3) the actual Incarnation.

Noetus of Smyrna followed Praxeas in the assertion that the Son of God is His own and not another's son. The doctrine was brought to Rome, where a Noetian sect was formed. Hippolytus was its most vigorous opponent. He insisted on the unity of God, but taught that the Logos became perfect Son first in the Incarnation. Callistus, Bishop of Rome, tried to harmonize the two; but neither party accepted his views, and both were excommunicated by Callistus, who really helped to prepare the way for the later teaching. He affirmed that God is a Spirit as giving

life. He is called Logos. Father and Son, a distinction in name. The Spirit which became incarnate in the Virgin is identical with the Father. The man Jesus, the manifestation, is the Son. The Father did not suffer as such, but in and with the Son. Hippolytus called this Noetian, and the Noetians called it Dytheism.

Following the Noetians, Beryllus of Bostra in Arabia marks a still higher form of Modalism, or Patripassianism. He denied the independent deity of Christ, but recognized in Him the deity of the Father, and declared Him to be a new form or appearance (*prosopon*), or manifestation of God. He was convinced of his error by Origen at an Arabian synod 244 A.D., and retracted. Here Origen took the next great step toward the solution which the Church was seeking. All previous teachers regarded the Logos as coming into separate and distinct existence at and for the creation, and more fully in the Incarnation. Origen asserted the eternal generation of the Son; declaring the relation an eternal one, and maintaining the eternal necessity of the Son to the Father, as the rays to the light. The generation of the Son is therefore an eternally continued exercise of living power. He did oppose the phrase, 'of the essence of the Father,' as it seemed to favor the emanation theory of the Gnostics; and he maintained a difference of essence in opposition to the Patripassian *Homoousios*. He still left some traces of

Subordinationism, but only of existence or origin, not of essence or nature.

The Noetians were succeeded by Sabellius, who made a great advance by including the necessary existence and activity of the Holy Spirit in a profound development of Modal Monarchianism. God, he taught, is a single unity, *monas*, admitting of no distinctions. For the work of redemption He appears in three different and successive forms of being, each of which includes the complete fullness of the One. These are not hypostases, but *prosopa*; marks, appearances, rôles or characters in which God successively manifests Himself in the world. After the Character of the Father gave the Law He returned into His original Being; appearing again through the Incarnation as the Son, returning in the Ascension; then revealing Himself as the Holy Spirit to accomplish the perfect sanctification of the Church, after which He will return into the original eternal Unity, and God will be all in all This was answered by Dionysius of Alexandria, at a synod 261 A.D., in terms of extreme Subordinationism. When Dionysius, the Bishop of Rome, was informed of these proceedings he corrected his colleague of Alexandria, in a synod at Rome 262 A.D., and issued a treatise in which he affirmed Hypostasianism against Sabellius, and the homoousios against Dionysius, who acknowledged his error and expressed his agreement with Rome.

At the same time, the theory of Dynamic Monarch-

ianism, which had expired with Artemon, was revived in the East by Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch. He affirmed the one person or *prosopon* of God; admitting a distinction of Father, Son or Logos, and Holy Spirit or Wisdom, the last Two being essentially identical attributes of the First. He held the distinction of the revealing Logos and the immanent Logos; one operative in the prophets, the other latent in God. The personality of Christ was in His humanity. He acknowledged the supernatural birth from the Virgin, and regarded Jesus as working His way upward by his unique excellence to divinity. It took three synods (264-268 A.D.), to discover his heresy, and then he was excommunicated. Another bishop was appointed in his place, but by favor of Queen Zenobia he kept his see. But after Zenobia was conquered by Aurelian 272 A.D., the emperor left the decision to the bishops of Rome and of Italy. At one of the synods the term homoousios was condemned; but we cannot tell whether it was because Paul himself employed it, or charged it on his opponents, trying to convict them of Sabellianism and so forcing them to condemn the term in self-defence. This is the way the question stood when it was reopened in Alexandria in the fourth century.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. II, pp. 231-380.

Dorner, J. A.—History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. I, pp. 253-326. II, pp. 1-201.

§5. The Intellectual Attack

The intellectual attack against Christianity in the second century was continued in the third. Philostratus wrote a "Life of Apollonius of Tyana," highly idealized and representing him as a heathen counterpart of Christ. The work shows the religious tendency of philosophy; and, although not so intended, was an indirect tribute to Christianity.

Ammonius Saccas, a Pythagorean who about the middle of the third century lived and taught in Alexandria, tried to combine the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies with religious ideas learned from Christianity, which he sought to supersede by his own system. His most distinguished disciple, and also the most talented and profound of all the Neo-Platonists, was Plotinus, a teacher of philosophy at Rome about 250-270 A.D. He sought to reconstruct a religious system out of Platonism, which would take the place of Christianity. His most celebrated scholar, who also wrote his life and collected his writings, was Porphyry, who taught in Rome, and died there 304 A.D. As Philostratus sought to portray a heathen Christ, so he sought to give to paganism a heathen Bible. He was regarded as the bitterest, most implacable enemy of Christianity; though only a few fragments of his work remain. His principal attack seems to have been made against the Scriptures. He and his disciple Jamblichus wrote the life of Pythagoras; whom they sought to put

in the place of Christ. The same line of thought reappears in Hierocles, c. 300 A.D., the procurator of Bithynia, who took a leading part in the Diocletian persecution; known only by the refutation by Eusebius. He put forward Apollonius of Tyana as a greater and better attested miracle-worker than Christ.

All these efforts show that it was well understood that in order to cope with the growing power of Christianity it was necessary for paganism to undergo a thorough reformation and reconstruction, and that a personal leader must be found and set up; for the personality and life of Christ were felt even by the pagans to be the great centre and source of the significance and strength of Christianity.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

See the Histories of Philosophy, Ueberweg, Erdmann, Maurice, etc.

Whittaker, T.—Neo-Platonists. Camb., 1901.

Elsee, C—Neoplatonism in relation to Christianity. N. Y., 1908.

Réville, A.—Apollonius of Tyana. Trans. 1866.

Bigg, Charles.— Neoplatonism. Lond., 1895.

Jones, Rufus M.—Studies in Mystical Religion. 1909.

Hunt, Mrs. John.—The Wards of Plotinus.

Theurgia, or the Egyptian Mysteries.— Iamblichus. Trans. N. Y., 1911.

§6. Mani and Manichæism

This remarkable system had its origin in Persia in the middle of the third century. Although independent of Gnosticism it was similar in its theories

of emanation and docetism; but differed by using ideas of salvation as a mere varnish for Babylonian and Chaldean theosophy, basing the system on Persian dualism. The Persian Mani, or Manes, is regarded as the founder. He was born about 216 A.D. and was flayed alive by the Persian king about 276 A.D. There are two accounts of his life and doctrines; one by Eastern or Persian authorities (the most important for his life) and the other by Western or Christian writers (more valuable for the doctrine). These sources differ materially, probably owing largely to the different stages of development through which the doctrine passed. His system was a thorough-going materialistic dualism, making no distinction between the physical and the ethical. It started with a realm of darkness and a realm of light. Satan with his demons ruled the former, which consisted of five elements: lurid flame, scorching fire, grimy slime, dark clouds and raging tempest. The good God with His æons and countless beings of light ruled the other; which consisted of bright light, quickening fire, clear water, hot air and soft wind. These contended with each other; not as forms of spiritual powers, but as primal material elements. Satan invaded the realm of light and the struggle began. The God of Light sent the primitive man with the five pure elements to fight against him; but being defeated, he was delivered by the Living Spirit. A part of his light, however, was captured by the darkness; and the ordered universe was built up out

of the mixed elements as a beginning of redemption, which is a physical deliverance of fractions of light from the darkness. In order to check this process of redemption, Satan produces the first man Adam, and in him concentrates the light he has seized in order to be able to watch over it and control it. Thus, here also the creation is the work of evil. Since, however, on account of this concentration in Adam, the light predominates, Eve, in whom darkness rules, is associated with him. Adam falls into sin; and Seth is born, in whom the light again predominates.

Thus, over men, demons and angels of light strive; the latter's power predominating in Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus (not the historical Jesus, who was merely the Jewish Messiah) and last, the Paraclete Mani. The ethical system is in harmony with this extreme dualism. The fundamental principle of morality is physical abstinence from all contact with the elements of darkness, and the assimilation of the elements of light. It finds its comprehensive expression in "the three seals of the perfect"; of the mouth, the hand, and the breast. First, abstinence from evil speaking, flesh eating and wine drinking; second, from all common toil; third, from all sensual indulgence. The adherents were divided into two classes: the Hearers or Catechumens, and the Elect or Perfect; like the ordinary Christians, and the monks among the Christians. The Hearers were not so strictly bound by the three

seals; and could engage in trade and agriculture, and even marry, receiving absolution for the necessary activities in order that they might minister to the Elect, who were above all terrestrial cares. The Manichæan Church was thoroughly organized. Mani was the head; and after his death was still regarded as the spiritual prince, and represented by a pope or Iman at Babylon, with a body of twelve Apostles or Masters as administrators. There were seventy-two bishops with elders and deacons as necessity required. Their worship was simple and orderly. Fasting occupied a quarter of the year. Prayer was made four times a day, and toward (if not to) the Sun and Moon, the highest manifestations of light. They claimed to possess gnosis, the perfect and complete knowledge of all things; by which the redemption of the children of light is to be accomplished.

In spite of the severe persecutions throughout the whole Persian empire after the execution of Mani, their numbers increased rapidly, East and West. In the East many of the earlier Gnostics and Marcionist communities joined them. North Africa became the centre of its Western movement, whence it spread to Spain and Italy. An edict of Diocletian, c. 290 A.D. (though held by some not to be genuine) ordering the Proconsul of Africa to burn its leaders, showed their growing importance. The Christian Emperors continued to pass laws against them. Yet the system was attractive and powerful, spreading very rapidly in the West. Augustine was a Hearer for

nine years, on his way from pagan philosophy to Christianity.

Its spread was due to the combination of a rigid materialistic dualism with an extremely simple spiritual worship, and a strict ascetic (not too difficult) morality, supplemented by the attractive personality of its founder. It had a great capacity for adaptation and a place and ambition for each individual. It gave a simple and easy solution of the problem of good and evil; the great problem of the period from the second to the fifth century. Its simple creed and repudiation of the Old Testament were also in its favor. The Paulicians in the eighth century, the Bogomiles in the eleventh and the Albigenses in the thirteenth, continued some of its teachings; while charges of holding some of its doctrines were brought against the Knights Templar of the fourteenth century. It is possible to find traces of its influence in the teaching of monastic asceticism and extreme predestination.

SPECIAL REFERENCE

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma, *passim*. See Index.

§7. The Catholic Church

(1) *Organization; The Hierarchy*

This is preëminently the Age of the Catholic Church in the first and simplest stage of its complete development, independent of the Empire or any secular power, and not yet subject to the papacy; finding its unity in the solidarity of the episcopate, as

set forth by Cyprian and maintained generally in this period. The spread of the Church, its increased importance, with the extension and growing complexity of its functions, not less than the struggle against heresy within and persecution without, emphasized the importance of unity and uniformity, and added greatly to the power and authority of the episcopate. The bishops were coming to have a more extended power than that of head of the local Church, in cases where the original single community expanded into several congregations. As these new congregations formed, they would naturally remain under the supervision of the bishop, and receive from him a presbyter acting as his delegate. Thus was added to the presbyter the new dignity of presiding at the Holy Eucharist as the head of his own community. The bishops retained and developed the functions of maintaining unity and administering discipline. Instead of the local community reproducing the body of Christ's own day, it was the universal, the Catholic Church, with Christ as its head; and the bishops of the several communities were regarded as directly or indirectly the successors of the Apostles, preserving the apostolic faith, writings and administration, and establishing a guarantee of the ecclesiastical order. The bishops became also the heirs of the spiritual functions and offices of the prophets, teachers and evangelists; and so appeared doubly as the continuation of the apostolate and its authority in the Church.

In connection with the territorial extension of the

bishop's jurisdiction we note, as an experimental substitute for the delegated presbyter, the appointment of chorepiscopi, or country bishops, having, however, no power of ordaining, except by a commission from the city bishop to whom they were subject. The custom was abolished in the next century and forbidden by canon law. But if presbyters were to have the authority to minister to the congregation, they must derive it from the only source from which it could be obtained, the episcopate. The question of ordination, therefore, was of the highest importance. In this rite was imparted to the recipient the gift of the Holy Spirit, which qualified him for the work of the ministry, whose chief function was to be the sacerdotal offering for the people. The full hierarchical view was completely set forth by Cyprian, on the occasions of the various ecclesiastical conflicts in which he was engaged. He found the unity of the Church in the whole body of the bishops as a consolidated corporation, acting for the whole Church, having its origin in the apostle Peter, from whom the whole episcopate is derived; each bishop representing the complete significance of the episcopate, and as such equal to every other bishop.

The Church thus rested upon the whole episcopate as the continuance of the apostolic office and equipped with all the apostolic powers. In this development the sacerdotal idea of the priesthood found full expression; i.e., the union of the conception of the office which ruled the community as divinely instituted and

claiming obedience by divine right, with the conception of it as an office of priestly mediation between God and man. According to Cyprian, the totality of the divine influence for all the rest of the community belonged to the bishop. While the supreme leadership and most important functions belonged to the bishops, and the episcopate was regarded as the source of all sacerdotal authority, yet the close association of the presbyters with the bishops in their origin by the Apostles caused the bishops to be bound by the advice of the presbyters in administration, and allowed them the exercise of a greater independence in an increasing number of sacerdotal functions. The deacons by their appointment and office were from the beginning closely associated with the bishops as they had been with the Apostles, as assistants and agents. With the increasing numbers and the growing importance and extended spiritual functions of the bishops and presbyters, a greater prominence was given to the deacons, who from the first had had the principal charge of the charitable works of the Church. These formed a link between the higher clergy and the laity; in addition to preaching and baptizing by the bishop's authority, they kept order in the Churches, received the offerings, prepared for the Eucharist, read the Gospel, administered the bread and wine to those who were present and carried it to those who were absent on account of sickness. Thus in many ways they were the direct agents of the bishops; at their head was the archdeacon who

became one of the most important officers of the Church, styled somewhat later the "eye of the bishop" and often succeeding him in the Episcopate.

The bishops, priests and deacons constituted the so-called major or higher orders; but the needs of the Church occasioned a still further extension of the ranks of the clergy, and the minor orders were formed; these were sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, cantors, catechists, readers and door-keepers. Those who were destined for the higher offices passed, in most instances, through a period of probation in these lower stations; only the sub-deacons, however, were eligible to the higher orders. Most important were the sub-deacons, direct assistants of the deacons, on account of the increase of the duties of the diaconate and the usual limitation of the number to the seven originally appointed by the Apostles (Acts vi:6). In Rome they also were seven in number.

The order of Reader was the earliest; and special interest attaches to it as it is found in the New Testament and was regarded as possessing a special gift similar to that of prophecy. At first he had a regular ordination by the laying on of hands and by the delivery of the book which he was to read. In the Apostolic Ordinances he is classed with the three higher orders and is regarded as filling the place of an evangelist. But as the bishops and presbyters gradually assumed the duties of preaching and expounding the Scriptures, his position fell back until it was next to the lowest of the minor orders, though

he still retained his honorable name. (Harnack, Sources of the Apostolic Canons, with Treatise on the Origin of the Readership by Owen, Lond., 1895.) The Acolytes were the personal attendants of a bishop or presbyter. The Exorcists dealt with those possessed of evil spirits over whom they had to repeat the public prayers and the formula of exorcism. The Cantors led in services of praise. The Catechists were appointed in the larger churches for the instruction of the catechumens, and Interpreters to translate and interpret the Scripture lessons where there was need, as in the churches of North Africa among those speaking the Punic tongue. The Janitores occupied the lowest position and kept the doors in order to prevent the intrusion of improper persons. In a way, all these shared the lower duties of the deacons, whose growing importance and occupation with higher services made some such division necessary.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack, A.— Constitution and Law. pp. 175-258. Criticism of Sohm's Theory.

Lowrie, Walter.—The Church and Its Organization. Based on Sohm. N. Y., 1904.

Gore, Charles.—Orders and Unity.

Moberly.—Ministerial Priesthood.

Falconer, J. W.—From Apostle to Priest. Edinb., 1900.

(2) *The Synods*

Synods were not originated by the Church, having been in frequent use in Greece and Asia Minor before the Roman Conquest, and continuing in the chief

cities of the provinces of the Empire. The earliest Christian synod was the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv), but synods came into general use in connection with the Montanist movement and the Easter controversies of the second century. The bishops of one and the same province were by community of interest specially dependent upon each other, and by the beginning of the third century provincial synods had probably become fixed and regular institutions in some parts of the Church. The presbyters took part with the bishops; deacons and laymen were present, though not allowed to sit. The letters of Cyprian show that, except in time of persecution, the Synod of Africa met regularly in the spring and sometimes also in the autumn. They did much for the maintenance and uniformity of discipline, and guided the developing theological formularization. Many of the synods had an influence beyond the division of the Empire in which they were held. From all these synods the definite decisions were officially announced by the bishops in the so-called synodal rescripts or decrees. The course of development leads directly from these to the synods of the whole Empire, convened by the Emperor.

(3) *The Metropolitans*

Inasmuch as the synods were held in the provincial capital, the bishop of that city presided, and thus became the medium of relationship for the other bishops and brought them into connection with the rest

of the Church. Thus the bishop of the principal or metropolitan city came to have a sort of superintendence over the other bishops of the province, and a special preëminence, such as the right to call and preside at synods, and to appoint and ordain bishops in the province. At first this was general only in the East. In the West, Rome was the metropolitanate of a large part of Italy; in Africa each province had a primate (in some cases the senior bishop); in proconsular Africa, Carthage was the general head of all the provinces. But we do not find the institution elsewhere in the West, at this time, on account of the small number of churches. Among the metropolitans an even higher rank and influence was held by churches claiming an Apostolic foundation, especially Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Jerusalem, and (for other reasons) Cæsarea and Carthage. In fact, however, this arrangement did not depend everywhere on the lines of civil administration, but arose out of the circumstances of evangelization which depended on geographical conditions. Indeed, the name metropolitan does not appear until the Council of Nicæa; and it was only after Diocletian had rearranged the provincial districts that, in the new provinces, the bishop of the capital became the head of the group of bishops, and the limits of the ecclesiastical province coincided with those of the imperial province. The Council of Nicæa confirmed the new arrangement; allowing certain exceptions which followed the old lines, especially in the West,

where the ancient metropolitan rights had to be respected.

SPECIAL REFERENCE

Harnack, A.— Constitution and Law. pp. 105-165.

(4) *The Primacy of Rome and Ecclesiastical Unity*

There were two ideals of unity; the first a spiritual unity in Christ and the second the visible unity of the Roman Empire. But the realization of external unity in the Church was from below upward; the single communities uniting in larger unions, holding synods, developing metropolitans, gaining a higher realization of unity in the one Catholic Church. There was no central point of unity. Jerusalem might have been such but its destruction (70 A.D.) and annihilation (135 A.D.) had made that impossible. The promises of Christ to the Apostles in Matthew xvi: 18, 19.; xviii: 18.; xxviii: 19, 20.; John xx: 21-23, were interpreted as extending to the bishops in Apostolic succession. We have seen how this ideal was realized in the Catholic Church of the second century with its unity in tradition, doctrine and life as the result of the struggle against Montanism and Gnosticism. Its outward and visible form and guarantee were declared by Cyprian to rest in the episcopate. Thus the whole College of Bishops, representing their local communities, realized, in their totality, the unity and catholicity of the Church. "The Episcopate is one, in which each bishop shares together with the others." Yet at best it was an

inadequate form of unity and only a partial representation could be assembled at any one time and place. There was no organ of catholicity, no visible head; and the unity was more ideal than real. Even the great bishops and metropolitans of the principal sees could not serve as a board of administration. There were various interpretations of the passage in Matthew xvi: 18; however, Tertullian applied the words as personal only to St. Peter; Origen, to all who share the rock faith of Peter; Cyprian, went further, and understood it as declaring that the foundation of the Church rested upon the one Peter representing the unity and head of the Apostolate, and thus setting forth the unity of the Church in the whole episcopate. At the most he conceded to the Bishop of Rome a preëminence of honor. Always, for him, the emphasis was on the idea of unity in the solidarity of the episcopate of which St. Peter was the source and symbol. The whole application therefore belongs to the past and thus has only a symbolic and theoretical significance.

Rome, however, was building up another interpretation; emphasizing the need and actual existence of a fixed point of unity in a visible head, guaranteeing the unity and universality, that is, the catholicity of the Church.

At first the preëminence of the Roman Church was impersonal; the line of her early bishops did not include men of great note in theology or in administration; but the Roman community did attain a high

reputation and great influence. This was due in part to the prestige of the city in the past, and to its position as the capital and centre of the Empire. Rome was the wealthiest Church in Christendom, and these riches were generously used to aid poorer communities; and she became not only the founder, but the nourishing mother of Churches in the West, and as the only Apostolic See in the West, made her influence felt accordingly. Irrespective of any theoretical claims, Rome had a great share in the development of unity and the maintenance of catholicity from the beginning. (1) She had been honored by the labors and martyrdom of the chiefest of the Apostles, Paul and Peter, and their graves were there. Indeed, with the exception of John, the other missionary Apostles had disappeared. (2) Clement's letter from the Church of Rome to the Corinthians, showed the influence of Rome; and the respect paid to the Roman Church was shown by the fact that the letter long continued to be read as Scripture in the early Churches. (3) The letter of Ignatius to the Romans and his reference to their Church in other letters testify to its high rank in morals and in charity. (4) Rome was at once the centre of heresy and of faith. Polycarp and Irenæus as well as Valentinus and Marcion found a wide sphere of activity in Rome. (5) There had been preserved a complete list of bishops in succession from St. Peter. (Nothing more is said about St. Paul.) (6) As Rome was the "compendium of the whole world," so it became

dition. Here origi-
f Faith, known in
ed. The books of
her at Rome, and
an Apostolic tra-
Minor. (7) The
axing the severity
ents, marks an era
ority, and for the
hops of Rome the
ew xvi: 18. The
obably to Callistus
ifex Maximus and
hecy of the future.
the West, Rome
at sees of the East,
c sees. It was like
e centre of its life,
wed and from which
. All the churches
cessant influence of
s has been said, the
ommunity; but every-
coming to be repre-
bishops, especially in
he theory of the Apos-
much to raise the office
ty was particularly sig-
e. Strong personalities
ephen actually put the

Roman bishop in the place of the Roman community; and decrees put forth as decisions of Rome, such as those in the Easter controversy, Montanism and Monarchianism, received a world-wide significance and finally victory. Thus it was that the interpretation of Matthew xvi: 18 passed over to the official successor of St. Peter; and "The See of Peter" is set forth as foundation of the Church, and Peter's successor as its rightful centre of unity and authority. (10) About the middle of the third century, Stephen, following up the precedent of Callistus, directly declared, according to Cyprian (Ep. 77:3), that by virtue of his primacy he must be obeyed by all new and later bishops, and therefore also by his fellow-bishops; and this obedience was actually given by the churches of Gaul and of Spain, as well as by those of Italy; though resisted by Cyprian and the churches of North Africa, and by Firmilian of Cæsarea. Indeed, appeals came to the Roman Bishop from the churches of Egypt against their Metropolitan, and from North Africa against Cyprian. (11) Dionysius of Rome at a Roman synod, 262 A.D., condemned the subordinationism of Dionysius of Alexandria, who then retracted his statements and declared himself in thorough agreement with the Bishop of Rome. (12) Even by the State his claim was in a way legalized when the emperor Aurelian (c. 272 A.D.) declared that no one not appointed by the bishops of Italy and Rome, should remain in the See of Antioch (Euseb. VII, 30). (13) The removal

of the imperial court from Rome by Diocletian left the ecclesiastical authority alone and supreme, free from political influence and intrigue.

Hence at this period of the third century are seen two principles of Church unity branching out; the aristocratic and the monarchical contending with each other. While the latter gives a more definite and complete expression of unity, the other preserves the deep, underlying national distinctions of single parts of the Empire, especially between East and West, and in the different parts of each division. The correspondence between Firmilian of Cæsarea, Stephen of Rome, and Cyprian of Carthage shows how wide a chasm really divided the one Catholic Church even then. Rome never was, any more than she is to-day, the recognized supreme authoritative head of universal catholic Christendom; but her importance and influence as well as her claims were already beginning to be felt, if not recognized; yet even Duchesne says: "There was nothing at the close of the sixth century to lead us to foresee that the Latin Church would one day be more centralized than ever the Roman Empire had been. From this universal respect to an ecclesiastical centralization was a far cry."

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Renan, E.—Influence of Rome on Christianity. Hibbert Lectures. Lond., 1880.

Lea, H. C.—Studies in Church History. pp. 112-139; 288-393.

Duchesne, L.—Churches Separate from Rome. Trans. Lond., 1907.

Bartoli, Giorgio.—Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome. Lond., 1909. The work of a Modernist, formerly a Jesuit.

Flick, A. C.—The Rise of the Mediæval Church. pp. 71-90; 148-163. See also A. I, §5.

§8. Baptism

At the end of the second century and by the beginning of the third, the service and theory of baptism became more elaborate. The candidate was questioned as to his faith beyond a simple profession. He renounced the devil, his pomps and his angels, and was exorcised to be freed from his power. The water was consecrated and the candidate anointed, then baptized by trine immersion in the Triune Name, in running water if possible, or, if he was ill, by aspersion with warm water; then he was given milk and honey and a white robe put on him, and he was anointed again and received the imposition of hands as an allusion to his Christian priesthood. Thus baptism came to have a negative and a positive aspect. In the Eastern Church presbyters and deacons were allowed to perform the whole service; but in the Western Church the bishops claimed the sole right to the anointing and the imposition of hands, which therefore tended to become a separate service, celebrated at a subsequent time, and called Confirmation. The baptism of infants continued to be practised, and sponsors were required — for adults as witnesses and guarantors, and for infants as security for the child's Christian training and later Confirmation.

§9. The Eucharist and Christian Worship

A still more marked development in theory and ritual took place in connection with the Eucharist or Lord's Supper. The simple forms of the Didache and of Justin Martyr were elaborated and filled with a more mystical meaning. The first step was to separate it entirely from the Agape, or common evening meal, and make it a distinct service; changing the time of its observance from evening to early morning, probably about the middle of the second century. It then began to be regarded by itself; and a deeper meaning was found in it. The oblations of the Agape were retained and closely connected with ideas of thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth, the gifts of nature. The idea of communion with Christ, feeding upon Him as the nourisher and sustainer of the spiritual life, is made more prominent, as well as the communion of the faithful with each other in partaking of the consecrated bread and wine. These then became, by the recital of the solemn words of institution, in some mystical sacramental way, the bearers of Christ. These ideas we find in more material forms by Irenæus; in more spiritual conceptions by Clement and Origen. It is a gift of God to men as well as a means of communion between God and men.

At the same time the other idea, connected with the oblations as the offering of man to God, was developed. First as oblations of the gifts of nature,

then as the consecrated bread and wine which had become the spiritual food of the body and blood of Christ, received by men, were in turn offered to God. This idea of a sacrifice or holy offering was emphasized also by the idea of the special priesthood of the Christian clergy, to which not only all the heathen religions but the Old Testament as well, offered analogies. Both of these sets of analogies, especially those of the Old Testament, had a strong influence on the development of Christianity. This sacerdotal theory was strengthened by the return to the Old Testament standpoint, and change of ecclesiastical office into a hierarchical organization, regarded as resting upon a divine and Apostolic institution. When once the sacerdotal theory had gained the ascendancy, the correlated notion of a sacrifice could no longer remain in the background. This was clearly seen in the Lord's Supper. First, the prayer of thanksgiving, which gave the name of The Eucharist to the whole service; then the gifts or oblations brought by the congregation for use in the sacrament; then lastly, as the consecrated elements and the whole service itself, as an acceptable offering to God. But we must examine this latter process more in detail. Already, by Ignatius, the Eucharist was declared to be the Church's answer to the Docetists who denied the reality of the Lord's human body. On account of their belief in the resurrection, they could not point to the tomb; and as the belief in the speedy return of Jesus in visible form faded away, in the second cen-

tury, the Eucharist became the sign and pledge of His bodily presence, the object of devotion and reverence that might otherwise have centred in a sacred tomb, had not the resurrection made that impossible. Consequently, this offering, this sacrifice, came to be regarded as having a special merit before God, and thus it became an external act.

Both of these conceptions are united by Cyprian; the doctrine of the Christian priesthood, after the analogy of the Old Testament priesthood, with the doctrine of the sacrifice, also according to Old Testament analogies. The priest, as the mediator, by the solemn words of institution consecrates the elements to be the body and blood of Christ, and acting for God gives it to the people; and he brings this consecrated offering to God and offers it for the congregation as the sacrifice of Christ. Already Tertullian had combined these different lines of development when he pointed out as the meritorious offering of the people, not the gifts of nature, nor even the prayer and intercession, but that which the elements became in the Eucharist — the body and blood of Christ and the offering of the Eucharist itself. (De Cultu Fem II, 11.)

It is Cyprian, however, who reaches the full conception, according to which it is the atoning sufferings of Christ Himself which the people offer through the operation of the priest. "The Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice we offer." (Ep. 62:17.)

With this developing significance of the Eucharist

as a mystery and a sacrifice went also the separation from the rest of the Christian worship, and the restricting of certain parts (such as the two sacraments, the baptismal confession and the Lord's Prayer) to professed Christians. This is the beginning of what is called the *Disciplina Arcani*. It is quite unknown to Justin Martyr and to Irenæus, and originated, probably, in Tertullian's time, in the division of the worship into two parts, from the second of which (the *missa fidelium*), all the unbaptized were excluded; the first, therefore, remained the public service for the catechumens and public generally. This public service was more developed and systematized, as longer intervals of peace permitted. Psalms and hymns, especially the Scripture hymns, were used. The Gnostics introduced original hymns. The Apostolic Constitutions mention a fourfold reading: Law, Prophets, Gospels and Epistles (including Acts). The fixing of the canon led to the definite use of the canonical Scriptures; though some writings were still doubtful, and others were long permitted in public Church reading.

The address was usually by the bishop; but at this early period might be made by a presbyter or by a deacon, catechist or layman, when commissioned by the bishop. Prayers were interspersed in different parts of the service, at first extempore but tending to a fixed form. Except on fast days, when they knelt, all (except penitents) stood with arms uplifted and facing the East.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Warren, T. E.—Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church. Lond., 1897.

Mortimer, Alfred G.—The Eucharistic Sacrifice. Lond.

§10. Church Buildings and the Catacombs

At first, of course, the Christians could have no special buildings for worship. When driven out of the temple and the synagogues (where they met at first) they used upper rooms or halls of disciples and friends, or even the lecture theatre of a rhetorician. The earliest traces of special buildings for Christian worship are found in the middle of the second century, and probably resembled the 'scholæ' or lodge rooms which were used by guilds or corporations for their meetings. They became more numerous during this period when there were long intervals of freedom from persecution. Even large and conspicuous churches were built, notably one close by the emperor's palace in Nicomedia, which was of so light a structure that Diocletian's soldiers levelled it to the ground in a few hours.

The name Basilica, applied to the early church buildings, implies that these halls of justice or places of exchange and general business were used both as places of, and as models for, Christian worship. They were oblong, rectangular, divided by two rows of columns into a large central part with two side aisles. At the front end was the porch and at the other end, the semi-circular recess or apse for the

magistrate who sat in his chair at the centre of the wall with the judges' table in front of him, and his assessors on each side of him. The three divisions, formed by the two rows of columns, were crossed by a space called the bema, elevated a few steps and occupied by advocates and notaries. Thus the building lent itself very well to the threefold division of the Christian congregation. In the porch, the catechumens and penitents; in the centre, the faithful laity; and in the bema and apse, the clergy. Separate buildings for the baptismal service (baptistries) appear in Tertullian's time.

Recent investigation has added much to our knowledge of the first three centuries from a study of the catacombs. The catacombs not only of Rome but of Naples, Cologne, Treves, Syracuse and Alexandria have contributed to this result. Christian burial places were called cemeteries, meaning dormitories, places of sleep. As they were usually arranged in caves, they are popularly called catacombs (in the caves). They often extended over wide spaces, and downward in two or more, sometimes five or six, stories. The full period of their use covers the first four centuries. The old idea, however, that they were used as secret places of worship, is no longer held. The spaces of passage and cells were not large enough, nor was there any necessity. As early as 150 A.D., Pius I of Rome mentions buildings made over and used for Christian worship. The catacombs were used for burial vaults, following the custom of

the Jews who preferred burial to the common practice of cremation. In properties given or purchased the Christians constructed catacombs in Jewish fashion, where they habitually and peacefully placed the bodies of their deceased. Undoubtedly they were used for religious services at a martyr's grave, or even for refuge and occasional worship in crises of persecution; but ordinarily Rome did not interfere with the worship of the Christians. In their possession and use of the catacombs the Christians ranked as any burial society. Certainly they were neither secret nor prohibited. Their chief interest for us lies in the artistic emblems in the Roman catacombs. We find the same decorations used in domestic pagan fresco; the four seasons, genii, butterflies, birds, grapevines and even Bacchus, the river god, Psyche, Oceanus, Mercury, Orpheus, Apollo and the three Graces, but all with a Christian significance; also children's dolls, jewelry, mirrors, toilet implements, locks and keys, etc. This at least shows that the early Christians were not completely severed from all heathen association and averse to painting and art, as has been sometimes affirmed. The symbol of Christ as the Good Shepherd is frequently found on lamps. Cheerful views of death and the future predominate and exclude even the memories of Calvary. There is an absolute reticence as to the Savior's sufferings. We find no crucifix and scarcely any portrayal of the familiar penal cross. Most common are the dove, fish, anchor, ship and fisherman; also the palm

branch, phœnix and peacock; emblems of victory and immortality. There have been discovered in the Roman catacombs only two attempted portraits of our Lord; one a fresco medallion with a face very much like the ideals of Leonardo Da Vinci and modern art. The story of the Passion and all scenes suggestive of sadness or fear are conspicuous by their absence; indeed, with the exception of the visit of the Magi, we rarely find representations of anything pertaining to the life of Christ, outside His public ministry. The selection seems to illustrate the dominant ideal of Jesus as the Pastor, Healer and Teacher of the soul. There are few if any references in the frescoes, to the Virgin Mary, apart from the visit of the Magi; but they are frequent in the drinking glasses found in the tombs. (See Dict. of Christian Ant., Glass.) Nor is there any early reference to the Eucharist; though many representations of the Agape, showing what an important part it played in the life of the early Christians.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Lanciani, R.—Pagan and Christian Rome. Boston, 1893.

Northcote, J. S.—Rome Sotteranea. 2 vols. Lond., 1879.

Northcote, J. S.—Epitaphs of the Catacombs. Lond., 1898.

Castellre, B. F. C.—The Church and the Catacombs. Lond., 1894.

H. M. and M. A. R. T.—Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome.

Gnericks, H. E. T.—Manual of the Antiquities of the Church. Lond., 1851.

Maitland, C.—The Church in the Catacombs.

Lowrie, Walter.—Monuments of the Early Church. N. Y., 1906.

Conybeare, F. C.— Monuments of Early Christianity. Lond., 1894.

Jackson, F. J. F.—History of the Church. Appendix by A. C. Jennings, The Catacombs and Early Monuments. pp. viii-xxviii.

§11. Christian Life and Discipline

Christianity is not a religion; but a life and the whole living of the early Christians was inspired by the example and teachings of the life of Jesus, all the more significant in view of the striking contrast with the life which they had lived previously and which was still lived by the world around them. Three principal characteristics may be noted: First, faith; the earnest devotion to the eternal realities and spiritual interests instead of the merely temporal and material affairs; inspired by prayer in the home three times daily, morning, noon and night, personal prayer at any and all times, a life in the presence of God, making the whole life of the Christian one continual prayer, manifested in a life of self-sacrifice even to martyrdom. Secondly, purity, in personal and family life; consecrating marriage, ennobling women, protecting and treating children as a sacred trust, and regarding the body as the temple of the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, brotherly love; a real sympathy shown in the case of the poor, the sick, even in times of pestilence, the aged, widows and orphans, friendless and afflicted, strangers and even enemies.

Special virtues were almsgiving, fasting, and prayers, tending to develop into asceticism or 'encra-

titism.' The discipline of the Church fell into three phases: for the catechumens; for professed Christians (the laity); and for the clergy.

With the enlargement of the Church, in order to insure the good character of its members and their understanding of its principles, there was required a period of preparation devoted to prayer, fasting, moral supervision and instruction, called the catechumenate. At the outset all civil callings or trades inconsistent with Christianity must be given up; that is all connected with heathen worship, sacrifices, theatres, gladiators, etc. Excommunication and penance were prescribed for Christians who fell into sin or lapsed into idolatry, heresy or schism, in order to preserve the community from public scandal.

The question of the readmission of those guilty of mortal sins,— that is, idolatry, apostasy, blasphemy and offenses against the ten commandments,— caused great divisions and several schisms in this period. All agreed, however, that it could be granted only once. The confessors frequently used their right of demanding the restoration of the fallen by means of letters of recommendation (*libelli pacis*), to such an extent as to interfere seriously with a wholesome discipline.

For the clergy an even stricter discipline was used, especially in regard to marriage, a second marriage being forbidden and marriage after ordination discouraged. In this period we find already the beginnings of the later distinction between the divine commandments binding upon all Christians, and the

so-called evangelical counsels, the non-performance of which is no sin, but the doing of which secures a claim to merit and fuller divine approval.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Dale, A. W.—Synod of Elvira. Lond., 1882.
Lightfoot, J. B.—Four Historical Essays: I Christian Life in the first and second centuries.

§12. Schisms

Five schisms arose during this period and gained some local following. Most of them were based upon rigorist principles, and protested against the milder practice of some of the bishops, especially toward those who had lapsed from faith in the persecutions. These were: the Schisms of (1) Hippolytus against Callistus, Bishop of Rome 220-235 A.D.; (2) Novatian joined by Novatus of North Africa, against Cornelius, Bishop of Rome 251 A.D.; and (3) Miletius against Peter, Bishop of Alexandria 306 A.D.

The other two were: (1) The Theodotians or Melchizedekians; a theological sect in Rome, excommunicated by Victor, Bishop of Rome. Their attempt to found a sect 210 A.D. was short-lived. They were dynamistic monarchians. (2) The schism of Novatus and Felicissimus against Cyprian of Carthage, c.205 A.D., objecting to his too vigorous treatment of the lapsed.

B. SECOND PERIOD

THE IMPERIAL CHURCH AND THE FIRST FOUR GENERAL COUNCILS. FROM THE EDICT OF MILAN TO THE END OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE WEST

313 A.D. TO 476 A.D.

B. CHAPTER I.

THE IMPERIAL CHURCH AND THE NICENE FAITH

313 A.D TO 395 A.D.

§1. The Empire of Constantine and His Successors in Relation to the Christian Church and the Overthrow of Paganism

THE growing influence of Constantine expressed in the Edict of Milan, marked a new era in the history of Christianity and of the world. While the alliance between the Empire and paganism was not formally completely severed by Constantine, there was established a union of the Empire with the Christian Church. The fall of paganism was a slow process not to be measured entirely by imperial edicts, but due also to many other causes not easily defined. The old religious institutions were so closely connected with the traditions and spirit of the Empire, and even with the daily life and popular amusements of the people, that it was neither possible nor expedient to attempt to break it all at once. Many of the noble and cultured pagans had a strong aversion to Christianity; so that patriotism and manly spirit came to be identified with the maintenance of the old religion, which long survived among them, especially in Rome and in

the schools of rhetoric and philosophy in Rome, Athens and Alexandria.

After the Edict of Milan, Constantine continued to favor Christianity. The clergy were exempted from taxation. The emancipation of Christian slaves was facilitated; customs and ordinances offensive to Christians were abolished; in 321 civic business was ordered stopped on Sunday, and in 323 heathen symbols were removed from the imperial coins. The Council of Arles was convoked in 314. The episcopal court was introduced into the judicial system. Much of this is probably due to the ability and influence of Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, and Lactantius, tutor to the Emperor's son, who were frequently with the Emperor and whose influence can be directly traced in many instances.

In the East, Licinius had defeated Maximin in 313 and forced him, just before his death, to issue an edict like that of Milan which assured the same rights to the Christians in the East. Thus Christianity was recognized throughout the whole Empire, and the Church grew very fast at the expense of paganism. Licinius, however, began to see the expediency of allying himself with the pagan party; and the friendly relations with Constantine grew more and more strained. Mutual jealousy and suspicion arose and at last resulted in open hostility. Licinius restrained the liberties of the Christians in his part of the Empire, and indeed a new general persecution was mentioned. He now became the leader of the

pagan party; and the struggle for the sole headship of the Empire was the life and death struggle between Christianity and paganism. Constantine gained a complete victory 323 A.D. At first he spared the life of Licinius, but on the breaking out of a fresh conspiracy he caused him to be put to death and reigned alone; triumphant Christianity sat upon the throne of the Cæsars. He immediately proceeded to carry out his religious policy in the East as he had done already in the West. Ascribing his victory to the God of the Christians, he declared himself a Christian and exhorted his subjects to embrace Christianity. All the decrees of Licinius against the Christians were annulled, the property of martyrs and of churches was restored, all the banished were recalled and those reduced to slavery were freed. A second edict restored the firm basis of equality and renewed the exemptions and privileges allowed to the Church. Pagan religions with their institutions and priests were not attacked, although immoral cults were more strictly prohibited.

The first Ecumenical or General Council of the Church was summoned to meet at Nicæa 325 A.D., in the effort to establish in the Church that unity which he had just effected in the Empire.

The next most important event was the selection of Byzantium and its enlargement and rebuilding, dedicated in 330, under the name of Constantinople, to be a new Rome; the sole imperial residence and centre of Christianity, as the old Rome (where the old

families of rank still clung closely to their old religion) had been the centre of the old Empire and the old religion.

Constantine's personal religion has never been quite clearly explained. He had a high regard for Christianity and the Christians, and showed himself their protector and supporter, with a genuine conviction in adopting their faith. He held it, however, after a pagan fashion; as is evident by his superstition in regard to the sign which he adopted as an emblem for war, a magical means of insuring success. There is also evidence of political sagacity in taking up the cause of Christianity and securing the aid of Christians against his imperial rivals, who were pledged to the cause of paganism, and whose violent deaths had repelled and terrified him. Nor did he himself completely break with the old religion. Religious liberty was granted to all pagans as well as Christians. He allowed all the previously existing religious institutions to remain,— temples, priests, sacred colleges, vestals, etc.,— and retained the imperial title of Pontifex Maximus, though he evaded personal participation in religious ceremonies incompatible with his profession of Christianity, much as Christians in civil office under preceding emperors had done. His officers were generally chosen from the Christians; if pagan, they were forbidden to take part officially in pagan worship. Yet he was for both pagans and Christians the supreme legislator, defender of public order and distributor of favors. He

desired religious unity for the Empire, and as this had been shown to be impossible with paganism he hoped to realize it with Christianity. The liberty granted to pagans could be only precarious and provisional, their worship was being restricted, and to renounce paganism was a sure way of gaining imperial favors; he bestowed special honors and privileges on cities which accepted Christianity. The sacred places of Christianity were officially glorified. Pilgrimages to sacred places had begun already in the preceding period.

He died 337 A.D., having received baptism on his death-bed according to a common custom.

Many of the charges against Constantine's character have been disproved and others are doubtful. Some of his so-called murders were politically justified; his wife Fausta, whom he was reported to have put to death, was reported alive 340 A.D.

The so-called Donation of Constantine, which purports to confer upon the Church of St. Peter imperial authority over Italy and all the cities and provinces of the West, as a grant to Pope Sylvester, is a forgery of the latter half of the eighth century, in order to establish the donations of Pippin and Charles to the papacy.

Constantine toward the end of his life issued a general prohibition of public and private sacrifices and of the rebuilding of fallen temples. Nothing remained to paganism but its legal privileges. It had a strong hold on the amusements and popular life,

as Christianity formed a great contrast with it on the side of pomp, spectacular ceremonial and amusements; and also on the official and administrative class on account of its identity with traditional patriotism. However, the example and influence of the Emperor, the spiritual power of Christianity, and the free activity of the Church helped greatly to undermine and weaken paganism.

The policy of Constantine was made more definite and intolerant by his three sons, who succeeded him in 337 after putting to death all their male relations, except two cousins Gallus and Julian, who were too young to be dangerous. Constantine II died in 340, and Constans ruled in the West and Constantius in the East until Constans died in 350 and Constantius (the real originator of violent measures against paganism), ruled alone until his death 361 A.D.

An edict in 341 prohibited sacrifices, but other pagan ceremonies were not forbidden. Another in 346 ordered the temples to be closed and sacrifices stopped under penalty of death and confiscation. But there were no pagan martyrs. Laws were obeyed and enforced only where public sentiment demanded. But on the whole paganism declined under the disfavor of the Emperor and the proscription of its worship. Multitudes accepted Christianity from motives of safety and policy.

One of the most significant acts was the removal by Constans of the altar of Victory from the hall of the Senate at Rome, where it had stood as the emblem

and seal of Rome's majesty and glory. This act was followed by a rebellion under Magnentius and the assassination of Constans 350 A.D. Magnentius issued a license for night sacrifice, which Constantius again prohibited 353 A.D., after his defeat of Magnentius.

A fresh edict against sacrifices (with the death penalty) followed in 356, but it was enforced only against soothsayers and magicians. However, Constantius confirmed the rights of the old college of priests in Rome and Africa, and still retained the title of Pontifex Maximus.

Julian, one of the cousins who had been spared in the general massacre which followed Constantine's death in 337, had been brought up as a Christian and studied at Athens as a fellow-student of Gregory of Nazianzus but was repelled rather than attracted by the Christianity he saw about him, and he preferred the intellectual allegories and mysteries of Neo-Platonism. Sent to Gaul in 356 as Cæsar under Constantius, he put down the Teutonic tribes and restored peace and order.

This success aroused the jealousy of Constantius, but the Emperor's death in 361 left the way open for Julian's peaceful accession to the throne. He immediately restored the old religion, reopened the temples and proclaimed absolute freedom of worship, thus winning the designation 'Apostate.' He took essentially the same attitude toward paganism that Constantine the Great had maintained toward Christian-

ity. Christians were not persecuted; but paganism was restored to its old privileges, the confiscated temples and their endowments were given back, the privileges of the Christian clergy were withdrawn and the imperial subsidies stopped. The use of classical literature was forbidden in the Christian schools, in order to deprive them of the highest classical education of the time. He tried to graft onto paganism the moral and spiritual power of Christianity. But his reign was short, and after eighteen months he died), in January, 365 A.D.) fighting against the Persians.

The death of Julian shattered the hopes of the pagan party. A Christian general, Jovian, was chosen by the army to succeed him, but died before reaching Constantinople, and another Christian, Valentinian, was chosen in his place. Taking charge of the West, he associated with himself his brother Valens, to whom he gave charge over the East. Valentinian was too much occupied with wars and disorders to pay much attention to religious affairs, but Valens, a decided Arian, was very bitter against Athanasius and his party. Valentinian died in 375 A.D., and left the government of the West to his two sons: Gratian, aged sixteen (375-383 A.D.), and Valentinian II, aged four (375-392 A.D.).

Valens was defeated and slain at the battle of Hadrianople 378 A.D., in which the Visigoths, driven onward by the terrible Huns, gained a decisive victory over the Romans; breaking once for all the

Rhine-Danube frontier of the Empire. Gratian then gave the East to the Spaniard Theodosius, a worthy countryman of the great Emperor Trajan. Gratian was under the powerful influence of Ambrose of Milan. He was the first Roman Emperor to renounce the title and dignity of Pontifex Maximus, afterwards assumed by the Bishop of Rome, and he withdrew their privileges and endowments from the college of priests and the vestal virgins on whom it was believed the very safety of the city depended. Indeed, it may be said that with Gratian all official and legal relations between paganism and the government were abrogated. He repressed the ceremonies at the altar of Victory in connection with the taking of the oath of office by the senators. Constans had removed the altar but Julian had restored it. Gratian finally removed it 382 A.D., and confiscated its revenues. The rebellion of Maximus and the murder of Gratian followed. An earnest and pathetic petition to restore the altar and its worship was presented to Valentinian after the death of Gratian, but it was answered by Ambrose with a haughty refusal.

Four years later, 388 A.D., Theodosius was called into Italy to protect Valentinian II and his court from the invasion of Maximus. There he remained three years in intimate relations with Siricius, Bishop of Rome, and with Ambrose of Milan. The Senate again petitioned 390 A.D., for the restoration of the altar of Victory; but was refused. The next year Symmachus petitioned and was exiled; at the same

time two edicts were issued, one for Rome and the other for the East, which sounded the death-knell of paganism. They forbade sacrifices, slaying innocent victims, entering temples, approaching shrines and paying reverence to statues. The cults of Lares and Penates were prohibited 392 A.D. In the same year Valentian II was assassinated, and Eugenius, a Roman noble and a Christian, succeeded him. He, however, favored the pagans, restoring temples and allowing ceremonies and processions. Theodosius defeated him 394 A.D., and became sole Emperor. He went to Rome and exhorted the pagan senators to give up their old religion. No one yielded; and the sacred rites and ceremonies were again prohibited, the temples closed and the priests banished. This brought many converts from paganism. Theodosius died in the following year and the final division of the Empire followed, between his two sons, Arcadius in the East, and Honorius in the West.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Boyd, W. K.—Ecclesiastical Edicts of the Theodosian Code. Columbia University Studies. Vol. XXIV, No. 2, pp. 9-32. 1905.

Firth, C. H.—Constantine the Great. N. Y., 1895.

Cutts, E. L.—Constantine. Lond., 1881.

Chawner, W.—The Influence of Christianity upon the Legislation of Constantine. Lond., 1874.

Arnold, W. F.—The Roman System of Provincial Administration.

Gibbon, E.—Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

Negri.—Julian the Apostate. 2 vols. N. Y., 1905.

Rendall, G. H.—The Emperor Julian. Lond., 1879.

King.—Julian the Emperor. Lond., 1888.
Gardner, Alice.—Julian, Philosopher and Emperor. N.Y., 1895.
Hodgkin, T.—Theodosius. Oxford, 1889.
Geffcken, H.—Church and State. Lond., 1877.
Saunders, G.—The State of the Christian Community before and after Constantine. Glasgow, 1882.

§2. The Intellectual Attack

The most noted polemic against Christianity was Julian's treatise in three or more books, known only by the reply written by Cyril of Alexandria, Julian's work and the other replies having been lost. Cyril answers it section by section; but even here we have only the first book, fragments of the second and almost nothing of the third. Julian represented Christianity as a deteriorated Judaism and criticized the later developments of relics and saint-worship already beginning to appear. Christianity seemed to him weak, contemptible and lifeless; a clever device of folly and wickedness.

Later advocates of heathenism were,— Libanius, a rhetorician, friend and admirer of Julian; Symmachus, Senator and Prefect of Rome under Gratian and Valentinian II; and Themistius, Senator and Prefect of Constantinople, later the tutor of the young Emperor Arcadius,— who were content with claiming toleration and religious freedom. The last and boldest attacks were made in the fifth century by Eunapius and Zosimus.

It was now charged that Christianity depended upon the favor of princes for its success and spread, while

the lives of professedly zealous Christian emperors were no better than those of many pagan emperors, yet excessive reverence was paid them by the Christians.

Attention was called to the enormous corruption which, under the show of Christianity, manifested itself in public relations and among the great mass of nominal Christians.

§3. The Spread of Christianity

Naturally under the favorable attitude and special efforts of Constantine and his successors (with the exception of Julian) Christianity spread rapidly and became more firmly and imperially established. In Abyssinia a certain Frumentius had been shipwrecked, attained great influence, returned to Alexandria, sought the aid of Athanasius and went back to Abyssinia (338 A.D.) as the first bishop of the Church there. It still retains many Judaistic traits. Arabia went through an Arian phase in the fourth century, but was restored to orthodoxy by Elesbaan, the Catholic King of Abyssinia in the sixth century.

In Persia the Christians as friends of Rome were persecuted in the fourth century; but peace was restored, although toleration was granted to the Zoroastrians in the fifth century, and the Church finally became Nestorian.

In Armenia Christianity found a footing and went through severe persecution in the third century. But the great work was begun by Gregory the Illuminator,

early in the fourth century, and he is called the Apostle of Armenia. His descendants held the patriarchal dignity. Isaac the Great with his friend and successor Mesrop gave to the Church a translation of the Bible in their own language, for which he had to invent a national alphabet; and the Christian literature of Armenia began. The Armenian Church warded off Nestorianism but accepted Monophysitism and condemned the Chalcedonian dogma in the sixth century.

Among the Iberians Christianity was spread by Armenian Christians in the second quarter of the fourth century.

From India Theophilus Indicus, of the island of Diu, had been sent to Constantinople. He was there educated for the Arian priesthood; and returning about the middle of the fourth century found several isolated Christian communities holding the Ante-Nicene subordination doctrine, probably commercial colonies of Persian Christians. He began to spread Christianity among the native population, being aided by clergy sent from Persia. He also labored in Arabia, where anchorites, monks, and 'stylites' were very successful among the wandering hordes. But as all of this country was swept by the Mohammedans in the seventh century, we find the most permanent and important spread of Christianity in the West.

§4. The Establishment of Christianity among the Germans; Ulfilas and the Goths

In the pre-German age Europe was inhabited for the most part by Celtic races. The part conquered by the Roman arms had been Romanized by Roman culture. In northern, eastern and central Europe they were exterminated or Germanized by the Teutonic tribes which came from the far North in various bands and, in the great Völkerwanderung of the fourth and fifth centuries, were gaining lands and founding kingdoms toward the South. But already, and partly the cause of this Völkerwanderung, vast hordes of oriental and Turanian races, Huns, Slavs, and Magyars, were pouring down from the far northeast driving the German tribes before them. Chief among these Teutonic peoples, which were loose confederations of different tribes, were the Goths (including Visigoths, Ostrogoths and Gepidæ), Vandals, Lombards, Franks, Alemanni, Burgundians, Saxons, Bavarians and Thuringians. They first founded settlements along the Rhine and the Danube, the two rivers which the emperors of the second and third centuries tried to hold as the northern frontier of the Empire.

Christianity had now (in the fourth century) become identified with the Roman Empire, in the reign of Constantine, as one of its authorized religions,—indeed as its chief authorized religion; and in the reign of his sons, as the sole authorized religion of the Em-

pire; and it seemed as if it must share the Empire's fate. The great question was: would the German tribes, which hung like a great war cloud over the northern boundaries of the Empire, in making their attack accept the religion of their enemies, or even spare it at the moment of their victory.

Even before the Edict of Milan Christianity had been established on the Rhine; and bishoprics existed at Treves, Metz and Cologne, and probably at Tongres, Speyer and Mainz. Also on the Danube, at Lorch, Pettau, Augsburg, Sirmium and elsewhere, where the Roman legions had their garrisons and colonies. The slow and for the most part peaceful Germanizing of the Empire which was taking place during the fourth century helped to ensure the triumph of Christianity. The boundary itself had become indistinct by the admission of whole tribes, by acknowledging others as *fœderati* or allies, and by the numerous *coloni* and *laeti*, who had become (for financial and military reasons) indispensable to the Roman state. Thousands of Germans had poured into the Empire; and since 375 A.D. a large majority in the Roman army and some of its greatest generals were German. This movement really facilitated the spread of Christianity; for many of the Germans received into the Empire were received also into Christianity, which was in turn carried by them to the Germans outside.

A more definite and organized work, however, was to complete the solution of the problem. Already

the Church had been established among the Ostrogoths by captives brought back from a pillaging expedition to Asia Minor 258 A.D., and a bishop of the Ostrogoths signed the decrees at the council of Nicæa. But the real result was accomplished by Ulfilas.

Ulfilas was born about 311 A.D., probably of Gothic parentage, not of the captives from Cappadocia. That he was of distinguished family is shown by the fact that he was sent as a hostage to the court of Constantinople about 332 A.D. Here probably, Ulfilas was converted to Arian Christianity and became a reader among his own countrymen in or near Constantinople, and began his famous translation of the Bible into Gothic. He was consecrated Bishop of the Goths by Eusebius of Nicomedia 341 A.D., and owing to persecutions by the heathen Goths he migrated with many of his Christian converts to Mœsia 348 A.D. Here he completed his translation and continued his great work of laying the foundations of the Gothic Church. Summoned to Constantinople by the Emperor in 380, he died there early in the next year. He has been called the Cadmus, the Moses, and the Luther of the Goths. His greatness is seen in his preaching the Gospel, organizing the Church and in the civilizing influence of his great personality. But his translation of the Bible had wider and more enduring issues. It was a great gift to the world, and may be called the foundation stone of all Teutonic literature. Much of the New Testament remains,

chiefly the Gospels (the Codex Argenteus) written in silver uncials on purple vellum; preserved in the University of Upsala, Sweden. Other parts are found in other codices; but the Acts, Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse have not come down to us. The original translation was of the whole Bible, except the Books of Kings (omitted because of their warlike spirit) and was made from the Greek with the later corrections and additions from the Itala. It was a vivid and vigorous representation of the spirit of the original, clothed in the idioms and colored by the earlier ideas of his people, and became a great and truly national possession. Goths and Vandals alike carried it with them on their wanderings through Europe. Ulfilas himself created the alphabet in which it was written. He also wrote treatises and commentaries for the further enlightenment of his people. Although an Arian, Ulfilas was not of the extreme or negative party.

About this time, in or before 370 A.D., the Huns, savage, cruel, barbarous and devasting, appeared like a rushing cyclone from the East. The shock of their onset upon the Goths of the Volga made itself felt on the banks of the Danube. The Gothic federation went to pieces. Part of the Ostrogoths submitted and were absorbed. Another part fell back and drove before them the Visigoths, some under Athanaric to the Carpathian mountains, and some under Frithigern to the Danube. Frithigern gathered the scattered Christians, Arians, Audians and Ortho-

dox; proclaimed himself a Christian and the protector of the persecuted. He appealed to Valens, who allowed him to settle in the Empire. But struggles, misunderstandings and the treachery and opposition of the Roman leaders led to the great battle of Adrianople, 378 A.D., in which the Goths gained a great victory and Valens was slain. For Rome it was a second Cannæ.

Southeastern Europe was at the mercy of the Goths; but they broke up into roving bands. Their unity did not outlast their need of defense, and they were settled by Theodosius along the Danube from Pannonia to Mœsia. The submission and death of Anthanaric, their barbarian leader, took place at Constantinople early in 381.

The Visigoths held strongly to their Arian Christianity, and in that form transmitted it to the Ostrogoths and Vandals and other Teutonic tribes. The conversion of the Goths arrested the decay of the Arian cause.

But the gain of a nation could not make up for the loss of an emperor. The defeat of Valens at Adrianople was a paralyzing shock. The Empire had no reserve to fall back upon. It also dealt a fatal blow to Arianism. The Homoians for twenty years had crushed out the rival sections of the Arians, but relied almost entirely on the influence of the court. On the death of Valens, the Homoians, and with them the Arians crumbled away. Gratian, indeed, issued an edict of toleration; but Theodosius, during a long ill-

ness, was converted to the Nicene faith and became its active ally, and it was victorious in the Council of 381 A.D.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Merivale, C.—Conversion of the West. 5 vols. N. Y., 1879.
Scott, C. A.—Ulfilas: The Apostle of the Goths. Lond., 1895.

§5. The Clergy

The authorization of Christianity by the Emperor served to accentuate the distinction between the clergy and the laity, and to emphasize still further the importance and preëminent position of the clergy, as well as to increase their number and to extend their official duties and legal powers of administration.

Both presbyters and bishops were chosen by the people; either by a formal vote or by verbal confirmation or rejection of a candidate, by the formula, "Worthy," or "Unworthy." This was most manifest in the choice of bishops. Often the popular will decided before the provincial bishops and clergy assembled and the regular elections could be held; e.g., Ambrose of Milan, Nectarius of Constantinople, Martin of Tours and Chrysostom of Constantinople. In Constantinople the imperial influence was usually supreme. In Rome and generally in the West, the bishops and other clergy with the laity acted together; though the Emperor retained the right of confirming the election of the Bishop of Rome.

Though the ordination or consecration was always by the bishop or bishops (the Council of Nicæa de-

creed at least three in the case of a bishop), the custom of presbyters assisting at the ordination of a presbyter by laying on of hands is very ancient. However, the bishop acted alone in ordaining a deacon; the idea being that the deacon is not ordained to the priesthood, but for rendering service to the bishop. The age for a deacon was fixed at twenty-five, for a presbyter, at thirty. Except for missionary work, the ordination was for a particular position. The great theological and educational centres like Alexandria, Cæsarea, Antioch, Edessa, Nisibis and Athens helped in the clerical training, while monasteries and individual bishops like Ambrose and Augustine did much. Actors, slaves, soldiers and mutilated persons were excluded.

The distinction between bishops and presbyters in regard to functions became less marked as the presbyters (though still subordinate to the bishops) increased greatly in number and came to have more independent charge of daughter and country churches. This increase in the number and importance of the presbyters under the leadership of the one bishop tended to increase the prestige and power of the bishops. The tendency was further increased by the action regarding the chorepiscopi (the country bishops). The synod of Ancyra, 314 A.D., had forbidden them to ordain. The synod of Antioch, 341 A.D., likewise forbade this and made them dependent on the nearest city bishop. At the synod of Sardica, 343 A.D., it was forbidden to set up a bishop in a village or small

town for which a single presbyter is sufficient, "in order that the name and authority of bishop may not suffer." The synod of Laodicea, c. 343-381, A.D., substituted for the chorepiscopi, visitatores (presbyters commissioned by the city bishop); the still existing chorepiscopi are to do nothing without the consent of the city bishop. With the gradual suppression of the chorepiscopi the presbyters took their places, with increased authority to preach, administer the sacraments, care for souls, and lead the community, but still in distinct dependence upon the city bishop.

From the time of the Nicene Council celibacy began to be regarded as the rule for the higher orders, but was not strictly enforced, though second marriages were not allowed and generally marriage after ordination was prohibited. The archdeacon appears in this period as the assistant and usually successor to the bishop; the archpresbyter as head of the college of presbyters and the visitator, a city presbyter with oversight of the country churches (later, in the West, called a rural dean). The order of deaconesses gradually lost its early importance; the Western Church opposing their ordination and at last in the fifth and sixth centuries forbidding it altogether.

In the East, however, the seclusion of women gave the order a longer continuance down to the twelfth century.

Other minor orders were added: the parabolani, or nurses to care for the sick, and the fossarii (or copi-

atæ) the grave-diggers. Also a whole set of functionaries for the administration of Church property; showing one of the important results of imperial favor. These were the stewards, treasurers, legal assessors, syndics, notaries, secretaries and keepers of the archives, frequently though not necessarily clergymen. Apocrisiarii, or clerical legates at the imperial court, became almost indispensable to patriarchs and metropolitans.

SPECIAL REFERENCE

Maclean, A. J.—Recent Discoveries Illustrating Early Christian Worship. pp. 108-116. S. P. C. K. Lond., 1904.

§6. The Patriarchal Constitution

Already the Empire, which in the second century had comprised forty provinces, had been reorganized by Diocletian and established by Constantine in one hundred and nineteen provinces, united into thirteen dioceses and these all included in four prefectures,—The East, Illyricum, Italy and Gaul. The hierarchical distinction of ranks among the bishops had already appeared in the Metropolitan and Apostolic Sees. The political organization of the Empire tended to increase this development and to make it more definite and permanent, although there was no attempt to group the churches according to the divisions of the civil provinces. Many of the bishops of the capitals of the dioceses,[1] especially in the East,

[1] It is to be noted that the word 'diocese' in this early period, and indeed down to the seventh century at least, means one of the thirteen political divisions of the Empire.

took the title of Exarch and claimed superiority over the Metropolitans and other provincial bishops. But the Council of Nicæa recognized the preëminence of the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch; to which number the Second Council added the Bishop of Constantinople, as being Bishop of the new Rome. Jerusalem was added by an edict of Theodosius II in 432, confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon 451 A.D., giving him the authority over the dioceses of Palestine and Arabia (taken from the Patriarch of Antioch). To each of these bishops was given the title of patriarch with an enlarged jurisdiction called a patriarchate, within which he was the supreme ecclesiastical authority, and, at the head of his patriarchal synod, decided all the affairs of the churches within his patriarchate.

§7. The Roman Primacy

Rome was steadily growing in importance and significance. Although still the stronghold of paganism, perhaps because of the struggle which that very fact necessitated, the Bishop of Rome increased in influence. Generally regarded as the successor of St. Peter, and the head of the only Apostolic See in the West, his wealth had steadily increased; and the extension of Christianity in the West, proceeding directly or indirectly from Rome, made the Bishop of Rome the natural and undisputed head of the Church in the West. As far as individual bishops are concerned, however, Hosius of Cordova, Athanasius of Alexan-

dria, Ambrose of Milan, Eusebius of Cæsarea and Augustine of Hippo were of far greater importance and had more reputation in the fourth century than all the Roman bishops put together. The removal of the seat of Empire from Rome, even as early as the reign of Diocletian (who visited Rome only once), had given the Bishop a free hand; and after that, the imperial recognition of Christianity gave to the Bishop of Rome imperial prerogatives.

The Roman Primacy of the fourth century developed naturally out of the Latin patriarchate of the third. The rivalry with Constantinople (to which the Council of 381 A.D. had conceded the precedence in honor next to the Bishop of Rome, because it was the new Rome) prevented its extension in the East; but it grew steadily, though not without opposition, in the West. But the monarchical tendency of the hierarchy was much stronger in the West than in the East and was urging a universal monarchy in the Church. For such a position Rome had the greatest advantages,—already realized to a certain extent in the third century and now greatly increased in the fourth century.

(1) Growth of appellate jurisdiction. At first this was a general custom; appeals were made to distinguished bishops (as Athanasius, Basil the Great and others), as is shown by their canonical letters. But the Council of Sardica, 343 A.D., declared that "a bishop deposed by Arian influence on account of his Nicene orthodoxy, who felt that he had a good cause, might apply out of reverence to the memory of the

Apostle Peter, to the Roman Bishop Julius and should leave it to him either to ratify the deposition or to summon a new council; and the vacant bishopric should not be filled till the decision of Rome had been received." This was clearly granting an appellate and revisory jurisdiction in the case of a condemned or deposed bishop, even of the East; but it was conferred as a new power, and apparently only on Julius in person for particular cases in a special emergency and by a local council from which the Eastern bishops had withdrawn. But Rome made it the basis of a general system, not merely of hearing appeals but of summoning cases; and, leaving out the name of Julius, quoted it as one of the Canons of Nicæa, in order to give it the authority of a General Council. The ecclesiastical law, as declared in the General Councils, 381, 451 and 680 A.D., was that all matters should be decided in the provincial synods with the right of appeal to the patriarch of that patriarchate. But Rome had been the giver of law when, in the civil provincial courts of the Empire, matters not regulated by local law or custom were decided according to the law of the city of Rome.

(2) Rome's established orthodoxy and doctrinal stability amid the great controversies of the fourth and succeeding centuries made Rome a centre of counsel and protection; and she appears uniformly as the representative and organ of all Latin Christendom. The only exceptions to the orthodoxy of the early Bishops of Rome were Liberius, who gained his recall from

exile 358 A.D. by subscribing a semi-Arian formula, and Honorius, anathematized as a Monothelite by the Council 681 A.D. Felix, the Arian, forcibly placed in the See of Rome by Constantine 355 A.D., is generally regarded as an anti-Pope.

(3) Amid the political confusion in the West and in the conflict with the Arian Goths and Vandals, the orthodox churches of the West needed a centre of unity and the protection of a strong central authority which Rome was in every way fitted to supply.

(4) The Emperors favored this primacy and growth of authority in the interest of order and unity in the Empire itself. The Donation of Constantine, however, is recognized as a forgery of the eighth century. But a decree of Gratian, 378 A.D., gave to Damasus the right of decision without appeal against all clergy involved in the schism led by Felix, the anti-Pope.

(5) In this period begins the series of decretal letters from the Bishops of Rome, which illustrate and confirm their power, first in a tone of parental counsel and later with definite apostolic authority. The extant series of genuine decretals begins with Siricius in 385; though he refers to the general decrees of a predecessor, Liberius (352-366 A.D.).

(6) The sixth canon of Nicæa recognized Rome's comprehensive position in the declaration that Alexandria should have authority over all the bishops of Egypt together with Libya and Pentapolis, just as such a superior authority was customarily exercised by the Bishop of Rome over the suburbican churches,

understanding thereby the political diocese of Rome, which included most of central Italy, and all lower Italy with Sicily, Corsica and Sardinia. In northern Italy, the metropolitan cities, Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, maintained their independence for some time longer.

Thus a strong and authoritative primacy was built up in this period; but the real and essential foundations of the papacy were added in the next period by Innocent and Leo.

The problem of how to settle divisions and contests between different bishops could have been solved by a recognized central authority; but there was none. Rome played only a feeble part at the Council of Nicæa, and little deference was paid to it by the Church of the East. Even in the West, the Donatists had put it in a sorry plight. There was no directing power, no efficient expression of Christian unity. The papacy, as the West knew it later, did not yet exist. The place that it was to occupy was held by the state without protest. The Christian religion was the religion of the Emperor; not only in the sense that he professed it, but directed it. The General Councils owed to him their formation, their progress, their general direction and the sanction of his decrees to make them valid.

Yet the bishops were not mere functionaries of the State; elections generally were free, and the Councils were representative institutions.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Allies, T. W.—St. Peter, His Name and Office. Lond, 1895.
Littledale, R. F.—The Petrine Claims. N. Y., 1899.
Guggenberger, A. (S. J.)—General History of Christian Events. 3 vols. Vol. I, Papacy and Empire. St. Louis, 1909.
Lea, H. C.—Studies in Church History. pp. 112-140.
See also A. III, § 7, (4).

§8. Theological Schools and Tendencies

After the death of Dionysius, 265 A.D., two different tendencies appeared in the Alexandrian School. The school of Origen served to introduce throughout the whole Church a more spiritual mode of apprehending the system of faith, and to purge it everywhere of a crude anthropomorphism and of the sensuous notions of Chiliasm. The old Alexandrians held to Origen and developed a free scientific tendency which culminated in the Semi-Arians in the midlde of the fourth century. The new Alexandrian School was the prevailing one for the fourth century. Its older representatives also remained attached to Origen. By carrying out logically the doctrine of the 'eternal generation' of the Son, they eliminated the element of subordinationism, and so broke away from the old Alexandrian School and came into closer relations with the Western theology. They still differed from the Antiochian School in their fondness for mystical speculative thought. With Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444 A.D., the signs of weakening began to appear. Origen's influence, however, through his writings was felt all through the East. The ancient Church

reached its highest glory during the fourth and fifth centuries. The middle of the fifth century (marked by the Council of Chalcedon) may be regarded as the turning-point; after which the decline sets in, due to the disappearance of independent research, hierarchical exclusiveness, narrowing monasticism, political oppression and encroaching barbarism. The preceding period, to 313 A.D., may be called the apologetical period; this period, of the fourth and fifth centuries, was the systematizing period. The school of Origen marks the point of transition. Internal antagonisms of thought became more evident and self-conscious; points of view appeared more partial and prejudiced, and controversies about single doctrines arose. The characteristic differences between the dogmatic tendencies in the East and those in the West became apparent. In the East the Greek intellectual spirit and speculative tendency predominated; in the West the more literal, calm and practical Roman spirit prevailed. This is seen in the contrast between the leaders, and also between the controversies,— in the East, Trinitarian and Christological; in the West, Soteriological. The Antiochian School also felt the influence of Origen, especially on the side of Biblical interpretation; but in place of the allegorical method to which Origen and the Alexandrian School adhered it gave greater prominence to the exegetical, grammatical, logical and historical or more strictly scientific method. It aimed at a positive, rational and logical conception of Christianity. The tendency in Chris-

tology is seen in the attempt to distinguish between the divine and human in Christ, with a greater emphasis laid on the human in order to secure its due recognition, but tending to an abstract separation of the two Natures. The Alexandrians favored a connection of the divine and the human in the incarnation so close that it was in danger of losing the human in the divine, or at least of mixing it with the divine. The principal members of this school were: Eusebius of Emesa, d. 360; Diodorus of Tarsus, d. 390; John Chrysostom, d. 407; Theodore of Mopsuestia, d. 428; his brother Polychronius, and Theodoret of Cyprus, d. 457 A.D. Other Greek teachers were: Cyril of Jerusalem, a semi-Arian but severely persecuted by the Arians and afterwards professing orthodoxy, d. 386; Epiphanius of Salamis, d. 403; Palladius of Galatia, d. before 431; and Nilus, d. 450 A.D.

The foremost member of the Old Alexandrian School was Eusebius (the friend) of Pamphilius, Bishop of Cæsarea, the historian, d. 340 A.D. The New Alexandrian School was directly opposed to the Antiochian School. Its most prominent representatives were: Athanasius, d. 373; the three great Cappadocians, Basil, d. 379, Gregory of Nazianzus, d. 389, and Gregory of Nyssa, d. 394; Appollinaris (the younger) d. 390; Didymus the Blind, d. 395; Macarius Magnes, d. 390; Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444; and Isidore of Pelusium, d. 450 A.D. Also Synesius of Cyrene, Bishop of Ptolemais, 410 A.D., and an enthusiastic pupil of Hypatia.

The Western theology, though intensely practical in its insistence on the application of Christianity to life, and emphasizing strongly the doctrines resulting therefrom, was much influenced by the theological movements in the East. Four distinct tendencies may be noted: (1) the school started by Tertullian and Cyprian, influenced later by the New Alexandrian School; appearing in Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine (who marked a distinct school in the West), with his followers Paulinus of Milan, Paulus Orosius, Marius Mercator and Prosper Aquitanicus, d. 460 A.D., and Cæsarius of Arles, d. 543 A.D. (2) The School of Jerome, d. 420 A.D., and Rufinus, d. 410 A.D. (3) The School of the Pelagians: Pelagius, Celestine and Julianus, Bishop of Eclanum. (4) The School of the Semi-Pelagians: John Cassianus, d. 432; Vincentius of Lerins, d. 450; Eucherius of Lyons, d. 450; Salvianus, a presbyter of Marseilles, d. 485; Faustus of Rhegium, d. 493; Gennadius of Marseilles, and Arnobius the Younger. Also, among the Latin writers of the fourth century are: Julius, Firmicius, Maternus, Lucifer of Calaris, Marius Victorius, Pacianus of Barcelona, Philaster of Brescia, Zeno of Verona and Martin of Tours; and in the fiifth century, Sulpicius Severus, and, of course, Leo the Great.

In the far East the Syrian School showed the oriental spirit,— mysticism, theosophy and asceticism,— yet practical and homiletical as opposed to the allegorical and critical. Jacob of Nisibis, d. 338; Aphruates,

d. 345; Ephraem the Syrian, d. 378; and Ibas of Edessa, d. 457 A.D.

The Church Historians should receive special notice. Eusebius of Cæsarea, the father of Church History, d. 340, wrote Ecclesiastical History from the Birth of Christ to 324 A.D., Life and Eulogy of Constantine, and a Chronicle, beside other works. His history is continued by three writers: Socrates, 306-439; Sozomen, 323-423; Theodoret, Bishop of Cyprus, 325-429. Theodoret wrote also Historia Religiosa, comprising biographies of hermits and monks. Evagrius of Antioch is the last real continuator of Eusebius and Theodoret. His history extends from 431-594. Theodorus Lector compiled an abstract of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, called Historia Tripartita, and also wrote a continuation of Socrates from 431 to 518. Mention should be made of Philostorgius, an Arian, who wrote a history from 318 to 423. Fragments only have been preserved by Photius, d. 891, whose Muriobiblion contains reports and extracts from nearly three hundred Christian and pagan writings. In Latin, Rufinus translated the history of Eusebius, and continued it to 395; but it is of little value. Cassiodorus, d. 562, compiled an abstract of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret in twelve books, called Historia Tripartita. Jerome's Catalogue of Illustrious Men, written in 392 and continued by Gennadius to 495, belongs in this list. Sulpicius Severus wrote Sacred History from the Creation to 400 A.D., also Life of Martin of Tours. Paulus Oro-

sius also wrote, in 417, a Universal History, not of much value.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Baker, J. F. Bethune.—Introduction to the History of Christian Doctrine.

Scott.—Origin and Development of Nicene Theology.

Bull, G.—Defense of the Nicene Faith. Lond., 1851.

Brown, W. A.—Relations of Theology and Church History.

Neale, J. M.—History of the Patriarchate of Antioch. pp. 2-152.

§9. The Trinitarian Controversy and the First Two General Councils

Soon after the persecutions ceased and the Church received a legal sanction for its existence, the theological controversies, which began in the third century, broke out afresh and, with the General Councils held in connection with them, lasted for nearly four centuries. The following outline presents the list of the first four General Councils in relation to the various phases of these controversies. (1) Arius asserted the humanity of Christ, denying His essential divinity. Condemned by the First General Council at Nicæa, 325 A.D., which declared His essential divinity. (2) Apollinaris asserted the divinity of Christ in such a way as to deny His real humanity. Condemned by the Second General Council at Constantinople, 381 A.D., which declared His real humanity. (3) Nestorius emphasized the humanity of Christ in such a way as to separate it from His real divinity, seeming to assert a double personality.

Condemned by the Third General Council at Ephesus, 431 A.D., which declared the one divine-human personality of Christ. (4) Eutyches asserted the personal unity of Christ in such a way as to obliterate the distinction of natures, making the divine Logos absorb the human nature. Condemned by the Fourth General Council at Chalcedon, 451 A.D., which declared the union in one Person of the two natures without either confusion, conversion, severance or division. (The distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained and both concurring in one person and hypostasis.)

The first, or Arian Controversy, is considered in three phases: (1) the Arian Controversy proper, 318 to 325; (2) the Semi-Arian reaction, 325 to 361; (3) The victory of the Nicene faith, 361 to 381. The controversy was foreshadowed and the preliminaries prepared in the theological discussions of the third century (see A. III, §§ 3, 4). It had its origin in the contradictory elements of Origen's Christology and in the antagonism between the Antiochian and Alexandrian theology. Origen taught the 'eternal generation' of the Son, which led logically to sameness of substance; but taught also the subordination of the Son, begotten with a divine nature, but of a relative, secondary divinity. The two original parties in the controversy were Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, and Arius, a presbyter from whom the controversy gets its name. Alexander in a charge to his clergy emphasized

the side of Origen's teaching asserting the 'eternal generation' of the Son. Arius answered him, taking the subordinationist side as a starting point. He accused Alexander of Sabellianism; and, in order to maintain a distinction between the Father and the Son, declared that, although the Son was before all time, "there was when he was not"; that "by the will of the Father he was created out of nothing," and therefore a creature subject to change. Alexander called a synod at Alexandria in 321 which deposed and excommunicated Arius and his followers. But he was very popular and his teachings spread. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Cæsarea defended him, and soon the whole Church was involved in the controversy. Constantine by letters and by the mediation of the aged Bishop Hosius of Cordova sought to reconcile the parties, but in vain; and the first General Council was called by the Emperor at Nicæa in 325 to settle the matter. The bishops were summoned by a personal letter putting the public conveyances at their disposal and defraying their expenses out of the imperial treasury. Each bishop was allowed two attendant presbyters and three servants. It is estimated that three hundred and eighteen bishops, about one-sixth of the whole episcopate, attended, so it is called "the council of the three hundred and eighteen" after the number of the servants of Abraham. (Gen. xiv:14). The whole number of the clergy present was about two thousand. Only seven delegates from the Western Church were present; two presbyters repre-

sented Sylvester of Rome who was too old to attend. There were three parties in the Council: (1) The Alexandrian party, at first in the minority; (2) The Arian party of about twenty bishops, led by Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia; (3) A middle party, strict Origenists (in the majority at first) led by the historian Eusebius of Cæsarea, one of the most learned men of his time in Biblical and historical knowledge and literature, philosophy and oratory. By the eloquence, learning and determination of Athanasius, a young deacon of clear intellect, ceaseless energy and indomitable will, the term 'homoousios,' i.e., of the same substance or essence, was accepted as expressing the relation of the Son to the Father, probably derived from Tertullian through Dionysius of Rome. The creed drawn up differs slightly from our Nicene Creed, ending with, "And in the Holy Ghost." Almost all the bishops signed. Only Arius and two Egyptian bishops refused and were banished. Three months later Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicæa, who opposed the term 'homoousios,' were also banished. But the decision at Nicæa was only the beginning of the struggle. An intermediate period of great excitement ensued during which council was held against council, creed was set forth against creed, and anathemas hurled back and forth. Athanasius succeeded Alexander in 328 as bishop; but the Arian synods held at Tyre, and at Constantinople in 335 condemned and deposed him, and he was banished by the Emperor. Arius

was recalled in 336, but died in the same year on the eve of his restoration. After the death of Constantine, in 337, Athanasius was recalled in 338. But Arianism prevailed in the East; Constantius being decidedly favorable to the Eusebians (the Arian party under Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was made Bishop of Constantinople in 338, and by whose influence Athanasius was again banished in 339 or 340). A synod was held at Antioch in 341, for the dedication of Constantine's church (so called the Council of the Dedication), which confirmed the deposition of Athanasius who had found a refuge with Julius of Rome, for the West was steadfastly Nicene. A synod at Rome in 341 protested against the Eastern synods and upheld Athanasius. To heal the division the two emperors, Constantius and Constans, called a General Council to meet at Sardica in 343. Here the Nicene party and the Roman influence prevailed under the presidency of Hosius of Cordova. But the Arian Eastern bishops refused to take part and withdrew to an opposition council at Philippopolis and there confirmed the decrees of 341, and held another synod at Antioch in 344 setting forth the "Prolix Exposition," but a synod at Milan rejected their overture. Constantius was compelled by his brother Constans to restore Athanasius to his bishopric in 346; but after the death of Constans in 350, the Emperor summoned three successive synods in favor of a moderate Arianism — Sirmium 351, Arles 353, and Milan 355 — and forced the decrees of these councils on the Western

Church and deposed and banished the resisting bishops,— Hosius of Cordova, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Calaris and others including Liberius of Rome (in whose place he put the Arian anti-Pope Felix) — and drove out Athanasius with armed soldiers as a rebel, putting in his place the Arian, George of Cappadocia, 356 A.D. Thus Arianism in the form Homoiousianism was supreme. Both Hosius and Liberius later signed the Semi-Arian Creed of one of the synods, and were restored to their bishoprics. At this time Athanasius stood not only against the world but against the Church. Hosius and Liberius repented afterward and died in the Nicene faith. This victory of the Arians, gained by compromise, was soon lost, for they began to divide again into various factions. The Semi-Arians or Eusebians held to the term 'homoiousios' (of like essence), and included many who had held to the Creed of Nicæa. The extreme Arians,— favored by Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch, his deacon Aetius, and Eunomius, bishop of Cyzicus, who gave the name Eunomians to the party,— held to the term 'heteroousios' (of a different essence) or 'anomoios' (unlike), so called Anomoeans, Heterousiasts and Exoukontions (ex ouk onton, out of nothing). This led to another series of Councils: Second, Third and Fourth at Sirmium, 357, 358 and 359, Antioch 358, Ancyra 358, Seleucia and Rimini 359, Constantinople 360. The compromise of 'homoios' (like, saying nothing about the essence) was proposed, but without bringing about harmony. On the death of Constantius in 361 the

court favor was withdrawn from the Arians and the way prepared for the final victory of the Nicene Creed. Julian tolerated all parties, hoping they would destroy each other. Athanasius was recalled; though again banished, and again recalled. A series of synods in Rome, Milan, Gaul, Egypt and the East, with the efforts of Athanasius and the three great Cappadocians, reëstablished the Nicene orthodoxy; but Athanasius did not live to see its final triumph, as he died in 373. During his episcopate of forty-five years he had been banished five times and had spent nearly twenty years in exile. Under the Emperor Valens 364 to 378, Arianism was still strong in the East; but in the accession of Theodosius in 379 (a Spaniard, devoted to the Nicene faith), the triumph of the Nicene Creed was secured; and it was reaffirmed at the Second General Council held at Constantinople in 381, although only 150 bishops were present, hence called "the council of the one hundred and fifty." The Latin Church was not represented at all. First, Gregory of Nazianzus and, after his resignation, Nectarius of Constantinople presided. The third canon of the Council assigned to the Bishop of new Rome the first rank after the Bishop of the old Rome, and made the newly founded Constantinople a patriarchate. The creed here set forth was that of the Council of Nicæa without any alteration, and it was declared the official creed of the Church and of the Empire. Only those bishops who held it were to retain their churches, and the public worship of heretics

was forbidden. There was presented at the Council, however, by Cyril of Jerusalem, the creed of his church, by which he sought to show his agreement with the Nicene faith. It had appeared first 350 A.D., and in an enlarged form in the Ancoratus of Epiphanius c. 374 A.D. This creed, as presented by Cyril, was approved by the Council, and by a confusion of history became known and accepted as the Nicene Creed, though it was not mentioned at Ephesus in 431; but at Chalcedon, in 451, it was presented as the creed of "the one hundred and fifty," put forth in 381, though recognized as distinct from the creed of 325. Somewhat later, by a process and at a time unknown to us, the substitution was made; and the creed of Cyril of Jerusalem has since been known and held as the Nicene Creed of Christendom.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Stanley, A. P.—History of the Eastern Church. pp. 03-303. Lond., 1861.

Paine.—Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism.

Moule.—Outlines of Christian Doctrine.

Kaye, J.—Council of Nicæa. Lond., 1883.

Newman, J. H.—Arians of the Fourth Century. Lond., 1888.

Gwatkin, H. M.—The Arian Controversy. N. Y., 1889.

Gwatkin, H. M.—Studies of Arianism. 2nd ed. Camb., 1900.

Robertson, A.—Athanasius. Oxford, 1892.

Baker, J. F. Bethune.—Meaning of Homoousius. Camb. Texts and Studies, Vol. VII, pp. 1-83.

Hort, F. J. A.—Two Dissertations. II. On the Constantinopolitan Creed. pp. 73-150. Lond., 1876.

§10. Apollinaris and the Beginning of the Christological Controversy

Before the Arian controversy was settled, discussions arose regarding the two natures, divine and human, in the one person of Christ; indeed this Christological controversy was involved in and grew out of the Trinitarian. Apollinaris of Laodicea, a fine classical scholar with poetic gifts, a brilliant defender of Christianity against pagan philosophy, and of Nicene orthodoxy against the Arians, attempted to explain the way in which the divine was united with the human nature in Christ. He maintained that a human being was made up of three essential parts or elements,— body, animal soul, and spirit or intellectual soul; and that Christ had assumed the human body and animal soul, but that the place of the spirit was taken by the divine Logos. The synod of Alexandria, 362 A.D., in opposition to this theory expressly declared the complete human nature in Christ. Apollinaris left the Church in 375 and became the leader of a sect which was condemned at the Second General Council. He died in 390, and his followers were later either reconciled to the Church or absorbed by the Monophysites.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Bright, Wm.—Waymarks of Church History. pp. 56 ff.
Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. IV, pp. 1-225.
Dorner, J. A.—Person of Christ. II, pp. 332-429.

§11. Priscillianism and Heresy

The earlier accounts of Priscillianism have been corrected in many details, and the general verdict against the sect has been softened, by the fuller knowledge gained from the writings of Priscillian himself, discovered in 1885 and published four years later by G. Schepss. Priscillian was a layman of noble family, great wealth, high intellectual culture, and deep religious enthusiasm with strong ascetic tendencies. He gained many followers; and, thinking the Church was growing too worldly, he established separate conventicles of his adherents, among whom were many pious women. The special religious services and ascetic practices drew their members away from the regular services of the Church and aroused strong opposition on the part of the bishops, particularly Hyginus of Cordova and the metropolitan Idacius of Merida. A synod of twelve bishops at Saragossa, in 380, excommunicated two bishops and a layman, together with Priscillian himself, and condemned their teaching and practices, which seemed to be confined to irregularities in form, and excessive asceticism. Priscillian, however, had assumed the title of doctor, and taught the wide distribution of prophecy outside of Scripture, and of witnesses of the Spirit outside of the regular channels. The movement continued to spread, and Priscillian was made Bishop of Avila. Charges of Gnostic and Manichæan heresy were now brought against the Priscillianists, and a rescript was

procured from Gratian banishing them from the Empire. Priscillian with some of his bishops then went to Rome and appealed in person to Damasus and Ambrose, repudiating the charges of heresy. He failed to clear himself of heresy, but secured, by bribery (it was said) the repeal of the rescript and the restitution of their churches. Just at this time, 383 A.D., Maximus the Spanish usurper overthrew and assassinated Gratian, and seized the imperial power of the West. He was induced to order the accused to appear at the synod of Bordeaux in 384, where one of the bishops was deposed. Priscillian appealed to Maximus who handed him over to trial, thus treating him as a criminal. He was forced, probably by torture, to confess himself guilty of magic and sorcery and condemned to death with several of his followers, in 385, one of the first instances of the capital punishment of heretics; (the first instance being the case of the Donatists, treated as transgressors of the imperial laws, and some of their leaders put to death in 316). This brought discredit upon all who were engaged in the prosecution and called forth indignant protests from Martin of Tours, Ambrose of Milan and Siricius of Rome. Priscillian was reverenced as a martyr by his followers. The sect spread rapidly in Spain and maintained itself through the fifth and sixth centuries.

The relation of the Empire to heresy runs parallel with its attitude to paganism, the object being the same,— to establish religious unity and to make the Church a unified organization contributing to the

social and moral strength of the Empire. Constantine established the precedent for imperial intervention in ecclesiastical affairs; his sons generally followed his policy. Valentinian I held aloof from the religious conflict; while Gratian and Theodosius finally and decisively fixed the alliance of the state with ecclesiastical creed and persecution. The Donastist Schism appeared in Africa in the very year of the first edict of toleration. On an appeal to Constantine in 313 he referred the decision to the Bishop of Rome, and called the Council of Arles, 314 A.D. Nothing being effected, the Donatist churches were confiscated and some of their leaders were put to death in 316; but this policy was soon given up, persecution ceased and the Donatists were allowed to spread. His relation to the Arians was similar. He made a strong personal appeal to both parties and then called the Council of Nicæa, and the Arians were exiled. In 326 heretics were excluded from the privileges and exemptions allowed to the Christian clergy. This failed to restore harmony; so he recalled the Arians and permitted the deposition of Athanasian bishops, and was at last baptized by the Arian bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia. The imperial forces were used under his successors to seat and unseat bishops and to enforce conformity to one or another of the numerous synods. The division was hopelessly confirmed at the synod of Sardica in 343, and the consequent withdrawal of the Eastern bishops. Constantius was strongly Arian, and the imperial forces were frequently used against the

Athanasians, forcing submission, except in the case of Athanasius who would rather be exiled than yield. Julian's policy eliminated political interference and left heresy a purely ecclesiastical problem. His immediate successors followed the same policy of neutrality. Valens, however, developed an extreme Arian policy which drove the conservative Arians into alliance with the Athanasians. An edict of toleration was issued in 376. But the decisive action against heresy, as against paganism, was taken in the reigns of Gratian and of Theodosius. Meetings of heretics were forbidden and their places confiscated by Gratian at the outset; though afterwards this rule was made to apply only to Eunomians and Photinians (extreme Arians), and to Manichæans. Theodosius pursued a severer policy. Baptized in 380 after a severe illness, he issued an edict ordering all subjects of the Empire to "adhere to the religion delivered by the blessed Peter to the Romans, the doctrines which the Pontiff Damasus and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, now follow." The Second General Council in 381, and a conference of all the sects in 383, tried to bring about submission. Another edict followed in which heretical sects were forbidden to hold meetings, to ordain priests, or to promulgate their doctrines; and their places of assembly were confiscated. The Arians found a little consideration in the West through the influence of Justina, mother of Valentinian II; and the emperor, in 386, gave them the right of assembly, and went so far as to exile Ambrose for resisting; but

he could not enforce the decree. The usurper Maximus, 383 to 388, championed the Catholic cause, and even ordered the execution of Priscillian and some of his followers. Justina died in 388, and Valentinian II withdrew his grants to the Arians. The victory of Theodosius, followed by the execution of Maximus, made his influence supreme; so that there was no hope for the toleration of Arianism in the West. Already, in 387, Theodosius published in Constantinople an edict forbidding heretics the right of residing in the cities and of ordaining their officials. This edict was repeated and enforced; so that, when Arcadius confirmed and reënacted his father's legislation many heretics became reconciled to the Church, and heresy ceased to be a political problem of importance in the East. Political considerations seem to have been of more importance in th eearlier legislation; but in the case of Gratian and Theodosius religious conviction was a stronger motive than political expediency, which accounts for the greater severity and wider extent of their persecutions. Theodosius made the violation of divine law equivalent to sacrilege; and such violation involved the loss of certain rights of Roman citizenship, such as leaving or receiving legacies, holding office in the court or army; and these penalties were enforced against some of the heretical sects, and also against apostates.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Newman, J. H.—Historical Sketches. III, pp. 195-202
Boyd, W. K.—Ecclesiastical Edicts. pp. 33-70.

§12. Monasticism

This is one of the great institutions of the Church, with far-reaching influences and results. The hierarchy was the development of the city; monasticism of the country. Asceticism existed in the Church from the beginning, and did not originate with Christianity. In the second century a class of orthodox Christians who desired to attain Christian perfection were called abstinents or ascetics, though Tatian joined the sect of the Encratites. By the third century Christian literature was tinged with asceticism, but it was most evident among the heretical sects, partly as a protest against the growing worldliness of the Church and the desire to attain a higher morality, and partly as the expression of dualistic notions.

Monasticism is an organized manifestation of the ascetic tendency common to human nature. Three stages may be distinguished. (1) Individual asceticism; neither organized nor cut off from the Church. (2) Hermit life or anchoretism; represented by Paul of Thebes, d. 340 A.D., and Anthony, d. 356 A.D. The life of Paul of Thebes written by Jerome is generally regarded as a religious romance. The life of Anthony written by Athanasius, though subject to the same criticism, is more generally regarded as genuine and became the great inspiring tract of Monasticism. Hilarion of Palestine, d. 371 A.D., was a follower of Anthony, and his life was written by

Jerome. Simeon and the pillar-saints of the fifth century are examples of the extreme form; but it was too impractical and eccentric for the West.

(3) Cœnobitism or Cloister Life. Pachomius may be called the founder of this organized form of asceticism, and its real origin traced to Egypt in the first half of the fourth century. At Tabenna on the Nile he organized, in 322, the first monastic congregation. He, or his sister, is said to have established nunneries. When he died in 348 he left nine cloisters with three thousand monks, which number had increased to fifty thousand before the end of the century. A more developed rule was drawn up by Basil the Great and is still in force. Favored especially by Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus and Chrysostom, monasticism spread throughout the East. Isidore of Pelusium, d. 450, was one of the noblest representatives of the movement. His associate Nilus, d. 450, of even greater learning, established the monastery on Mount Sinai in which so many valuable manuscripts have been discovered. Many heretical monastic societies were founded: (1) the Eustathians, asserting that marriage debarred from salvation. (2) The Audians, severely ascetic. (3) The Euchites, pantheistic and antinomian.

In the West monasticism originated later and was more practical and varied. Athanasius introduced it during his banishment to Rome in 340. Ambrose established a monastery at Milan, and his sister was one of the first nuns. Augustine encouraged it,

though not very consistently with his anti-Pelagian doctrines. Jerome and Rufinus were among the most prominent agents of its spread. Jerome's wealthy and distinguished disciple Paula after devout pilgrimages in the East settled in Bethlehem, where she founded a monastery and three nunneries in which she spent twenty years as abbess. It was planted in Gaul by Martin of Tours in 360 and developed by John Cassianus a little later. But permanent Western Monasticism really begins with Benedict of Nursia and the founding of Monte Cassino and the Benedictine order, 529 A.D.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Montalembert, C. F. De.—Monks of the West. 7 vols. Lond., 1896.

Smith, I. G.—Christian Monasticism. Lond., 1892.

Allies, T. W.—Monastic Life. pp. 1-193. Lond., 1896.

Wishart, A. W.—Monks and Monasteries. Trenton, 1902.

Kingsley, Charles.—Hermits. Lond., 1885.

Flick, A. C.—Mediæval Church. pp. 198-228.

Harnack, A.—Monasticism and Confessions of St. Augustine. Two Essays. Lond., 1901.

Lea, H. C.—Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy. I, pp. 21-108. 3rd ed. 2 vols. N. Y., 1907.

Butler, D. C.—Early Egyptian Monasticism: The Lansiac History of Palladius. Camb. Texts and Studies. Vol. VI.

Woodhouse, F. C.—Monasticism. Lond., 1896.

Allen, A. V. G.—Christian Institutions. pp. 137-178.

James, Wm.—Varieties of Religious Experience. pp. 296 ff.

§13. Christian Worship and Holy Days

The change in the legal and social position of Christianity produced an important effect upon its worship. The majority of Christians in the early Church had been of the poorer and lower classes; worshipping in private houses and out-of-the-way places in secrecy and simplicity. Now, large numbers came from the wealthy aristocracy with the splendor and political influence of the court. The Church laid aside her lowly servant garb and put on a brilliant imperial robe. The fine arts were brought into her service, and the settings and surroundings of the heathen temple were transferred to the Christian Church and dedicated to Christ, to the Virgin Mary and to the saints and martyrs. The new emphasis and meaning given to priesthood, sacrifice and altar fixed the change. Church festivals increased, pilgrimages and processions multiplied. The worship became dramatic and spectacular.

Already in the Nicene age we find almost all the essential features of the modern Roman and Greek worship. The Christian Sunday, observed by the Apostles and established by the legislation of Constantine, was regarded as a new institution, and not until the Reformation as a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath. Constantine's successors extended the Sunday legislation to other holy days. Theatrical entertainments and amusements were forbidden on Sunday, but the prohibition was not strictly enforced. Yearly

festivals also were adopted. Yet, until the fourth century, only two of these were kept: Easter and Pentecost (Whitsunday). A little before the middle of the fourth century Christmas, or Epiphany (two names of the same festival), was introduced; but not till the last quarter of the century was a fuller festal cycle adopted. The first reference to December 25 as the festival of the Nativity is in 336. Epiphany, January 6, goes back to 300 A.D. in some parts of the East. The two were originally one festival,—the Nativity; and the different dates were due to different calculations. Our Lord's life was reckoned as covering an exact number of years; the Annunciation and Crucifixion both taking place at the Passover. In Rome, by Hippolytus, at the beginning of the third century this day was calculated to be March 25; and the Nativity, nine months afterwards, would be December 25. In the East, probably in the same way, April 6 was regarded as the day; making the Nativity (January 6) called Epiphany, celebrating also the Baptism of Jesus. At Antioch, c. 375 A.D., Christmas was added to commemorate the Birth, and Epiphany retained as commemorating the Baptism; and this custom gradually spread. In the West, in like manner, the Epiphany was introduced into the Calendar at about the same time; thought by some to commemorate the Adoration of the Magi, by others the Baptism and by others the Marriage at Cana. Now, in the West, it commemorates all three. The cycle in the Apostolic Constitution, c. 375 A.D., embraces

Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Christmas, Epiphany, Apostles' Days, St. Stephen and All Martyrs. The origin of many a festival is to be found in some local celebration. The earliest evidence of the celebration of the Presentation and of Palm Sunday is in 385; probably connected especially with Jerusalem. Similarly, Holy Cross Day, or the Exaltation of the Cross, dates from September 14, 335 A.D., the dedication of churches built by Constantine in Jerusalem, to commemorate Calvary and the discovery of the true Cross by his mother Helena. Another day originated in the Gallican Church, and was called the Invention or Finding of the Cross, May 3.

At the end of the fourth century we find a series of Saints' Days after Christmas: St. Stephen, December 26; St. James and St. John, 27; St. Peter and St. Paul, 28. At Rome, June 29 was observed for St. Peter and St. Paul in the fourth century, and Holy Innocents celebrated on December 28.

The regular weekly fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays (Days of Stations), did not become universal until the fourth century; the fast being kept until midday, or even 3 P.M. Saturday was sometimes observed as a fast in the West, but in the East only by heretics. A special pre-Easter fast is mentioned by Irenæus at the end of the second century, lasting one or two days. In the third century already this had extended to a week in some places. The Montanists kept two weeks. The Quadragesima or Forty days before Easter are mentioned early in the fourth cen-

tury as a solemn season of prayer and service and preparation for baptism, but not as a fast; though by the middle of the century the practice of fasting is connected with them, as is seen in the Apostolic Constitutions. These forty days extended over six weeks; as Sundays, and sometimes Saturdays, were not counted, and thus the forty days were not continuous. In Rome a three weeks' fast was observed, which Duchesne thinks comprised the first, fourth and sixth weeks in the Lenten period. Gregory the Great fixed Ash-Wednesday as the beginning of Lent.

The Paschal controversy of the third century was continued in the fourth, and ended with the victory of the Roman and Alexandrian practice of keeping Easter not on a fixed day of the month like Christmas, but always on a Sunday,— the first after the full moon of the Spring Equinox. The Council of Arles decreed that the same day should be observed everywhere, to be determined by the Bishop of Rome. This order was not observed; and the settlement of the question was the second main object of the Council of Nicæa. It was there decided that Easter should be observed on Sunday, but always after the fourteenth of Nisan (the Jewish Passover); thus deciding against the Quartodecimans who believed in celebrating it on the fourteenth. But the exact Sunday for observing Easter varied until fixed by Dionysius Exiguus the author of our Christian Calendar. The Gallican and British Christians still continued the old reckoning, and thus brought about the conflict

settled by the Council of Whitby, 664 A.D. Next in importance are the festivals in connection with the Virgin Mary. The veneration of the Virgin Mary was originally only a reflection of the worship of Christ, and her feasts were designed to contribute to His glorification; but this gradually changed, until the "mother of the Lord," became the "mother of God." The application of the term 'Theotokos' to the Virgin Mary and its triumphant recognition in the Nestorian controversy carried the veneration of Mary to something so near worship that it is difficult, sometimes impossible, to distinguish it in practice. The first festival of the Virgin was the Annunciation, really the festival of the Incarnation; reckoned as occurring on the same day of the month as the Passover, and therefore, March 25. The festival of the Presentation of Christ in the Temple also shows the Christ as well as Virgin aspect of the early festivals. Forty days after the birth of Jesus, it fell therefore on February 2, and was celebrated in Jerusalem in the fourth century. Rome did not celebrate any festival of the Virgin before the seventh century; when the festivals of the Assumption, Nativity, and later of the Presentation, Visitation and Immaculate Conception were introduced.

The term Saints (the title given generally by Apostles to all Christian believers) gradually came to be restricted to the departed heroes of the Church, especially to the martyrs of the first three centuries, including the Apostles and Evangelists and their

associates. The popular voice commonly decided the matter; some saints being venerated only in the region where they lived and died, others receiving a national or even universal homage. The veneration of the saints increased with the decrease of martyrdom and with the remoteness of their time. The recently discovered Church Orders, and especially the Pilgrimage of Silvia, dated 385 A.D., have thrown much new light on this subject. The Christian Calendar may be said to date from the fourth century. Two of Rome are extant: one, of 354 A.D., containing for the first time the Christian week beginning with Sunday; the other, 448 A.D., containing Christian feast days and holidays, four of Christ and six martyrs' days. Other calendars of local use have been discovered, and lists of saints' days belonging to individual churches. Such tables are the groundwork of the Calendar and the martyrologies. At first each community or province had its own list. These local registers were called diptychs (two leaves); and commonly contained, beside the names of the martyrs, names of early bishops and still living benefactors who were to be named by the priest in the prayer before the consecration in the Eucharist. The great influence of Rome gave to the Roman festival list and calendar the chief currency in the West. The Eastern calendar is richer in saints from the Old Testament than is the Western.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Maclean, A. J.—Recent Discoveries. pp. 38-72.
Wordsworth, John.—Ministry of Grace. Chaps. VI to VIII.

§14. Architecture

"When the Church had rest, Christian temples rose loftier and grander than those which had been destroyed."—Eusebius, H. E., x. 2, 3. The basilica continued to be the general type, and the Gothic churches of the West were derived from this form. Later, side naves were added; thus giving the church the form of the cross. In the East the dome was added and the style called the Byzantine. A full description of a church in the middle of the fourth century gave three entrances into the courtyard; for the church or group of church buildings seems to have been walled in. The church extended east and west, as was usual but not universal, with the bishop's throne at the east. On the right and left were the places of the presbyters, the older ones on the right and the younger on the left. This part was raised three steps; and the altar was in front of the bishop's throne, in the center of the sanctuary. The bishop celebrated standing at the middle of the altar and facing east; the presbyters just back of him on either side, the widows behind the presbyters on the left, the deacons behind the presbyters on the right, and behind the deacons the readers, subdeacons and deaconesses. The sanctuary had a veil or curtain of pure linen. Veils were common after the fourth century, and are still universal in the East. They were not general in the West, and probably not used in the fifth century. In the nave, the men and women were separated;

the catechumens had a special chamber. The furniture of the church consisted of the altar, in the centre of the sanctuary, with the chairs for the bishop and presbyters in a row against the semi-circular wall of the apse behind it. The early altar was of wood, at first a table, as it was called, later, a chest, with a lid; after the fifth century usually of stone or marble often overlaid with gold or silver. In front of this was the lectern or "place of the lection," outside of the sanctuary, probably on a raised platform specially provided, sometimes called the ambo or pulpit. The sermon was delivered from the bishop's chair (ex cathedra), or from this reading desk, or from the railings of the choir (cancelli). The doors of the nave were guarded by the deacons and no one allowed to enter after the beginning of the service, until the first hymn. Then they were brought in by the deacons and a special petition offered for them in the Litany. There were other buildings in the enclosure: a deacon's chamber, with a cloister, "a place of commemoration," opening off from the sanctuary like a side chapel; a baptistry at the west end of the church, usually octagonal or circular, but sometimes oblong; it had a veil and one entrance and three exits (one God in three Persons). The font was a large tank arranged so that the water should be flowing into and out of it; a treasury; a bishop's house and sometimes houses for other clergy, widows and deaconesses; also a guest house, presided over by the chief deacon (not archdeacon).

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Maclean, A. J.—Recent Discoveries. pp. 73-86.
Bennett, C. W.—Christian Archæology. N. Y., 1881.
Martin.—Ecclesiastical Architecture.
Brown, G. Baldwin.—From Schola to Cathedral. Edinb., 1886.
Smith, T. Roger.—Early Christian Architecture.

§15. Ecclesiastical Law and Episcopal Courts

The chief sources of the law of the Church were naturally the canons of the General Councils; to which were added the decrees of the most important provincial synods, and the orders and letters of eminent bishops, especially the patriarchs, and the edicts of the emperors. From these sources arose various collections of ecclesiastical laws early in the fifth century,—in the East, North Africa, Italy, Gaul and Spain,—which, however, had only provincial authority and were not in perfect agreement. Gradually two collections became preëminent, one in the East, and the other in the West. Dionysius Exiguus, c. 500 A.D., who introduced the Christian Calendar and established the birth of Christ as "the turning point of the Ages" (B.C. and A.D.), translated a collection of canons from Greek into Latin. This was the basis and beginning of the authoritative ecclesiastical law of the West. About the middle of the sixth century John Scholasticus, later Patriarch of Constantinople, published a collection of canons in Greek, which had a similar position in the East. These books of law served to complete and confirm the hierarchical

organization, to regulate the life of the clergy, and to promote order and discipline. The union of Church and State increased the stringency of discipline and led to a penal code for spiritual offences. The State lent the authority of law and the power of civil penalties to the ecclesiastical administration. Yet, in a way, discipline was weakened. Firm against heretics and schismatics, it became more lax toward practical errors. By the *jus circa sacra* the emperor claimed the supreme direction of all religious matters and the right of determining legally all the relations between Church and State, keeping the peace and unity of the Church, guarding orthodoxy, looking after the interests of the Church and clergy, and maintaining the authority of ecclesiastical law. This may be seen in the Theodosian Code, 438 A.D., and in the Code of Justinian, 537 A.D. In matters of faith and spiritual concern the emperor summoned ecumenical synods or general councils, the decrees of which had legal validity throughout the Empire when ratified by him. Direct interference in such matters, by imperial edict, is not observed until the time of the later emperors, especially Justinian. Another source of Church law was the penitential system, from which arose a traditional or common law, collections of which are found in the Teaching of the Twelve, Ordinances of the Holy Apostles, Apostolic Constitutions, Canons of the Holy Apostles, and in other Church orders.

One of the most impressive evidences of the union

of the Empire and the Church in the fourth century was the Episcopal Court. From the beginning, the settlements of disputes between Christians had been made among the Christians themselves, and a jurisdiction of the congregation over other than the moral actions of its members had developed. The Apostolic Constitutions show a well-developed administration of justice in the third and fourth centuries. Minor suits and difficulties were heard by the deacons, more serious ones by the bishop, each Monday, assisted by the deacons and presbyters. The rules were not those of common law, but were suggested by the spiritual conceptions of Christianity. The rulers of the world were not to pass judgment on the Christians; if possible the contending parties should be reconciled without the judgment of the bishop, but his sentence, once rendered, must be accepted as final on pain of excommunication. By two edicts of Constantine the episcopal arbitration was transformed into a legal mode of procedure, and the episcopal courts were given a place in the judicial system of the Empire. The bishop, therefore, held a place similar to that of the judge of the public law courts. Moreover, the conception of his office as arbitrator was that of an authority transcending the regular civil courts, for the justice he administered arose from his individual conception of right and wrong, and as not even minors could appeal from his decisions, he enjoyed a wider range of action than the civil judges; indeed, in this respect, his jurisdiction was equal to that of the pretorian prefect.

This recognition of the episcopal courts as a source of secular justice is unique in the history of Roman jurisprudence. No civil court was ever given such unlimited authority. The emperors recognized the right of plaintiffs to take their civil cases before the bishops. Recourse to ecclesiastical tribunal was not limited to cases between Christians, and could be had at any time, even if a secular judge had commenced to give sentence. It was not a court of appeal but a special court. Inspiring more confidence and with easier access, it was more simple, more honest, much speedier and less costly. It furnishes an honorable testimony to the Christian Church.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Boyd, W. K.—Ecclesiastical Edicts. pp. 87-102.

Fulton, J.—Index Canonum. N. Y., 1892.

Bright, Wm.—Notes on the Canons of the first four General Councils. N. Y., 1892.

Howard, G. B.—Canons of the Primitive Church. Lond., 1896.

B. CHAPTER II.

THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE NICENE FAITH AND THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE IMPERIAL CHURCH

395 A.D. TO 476 A.D.

§1. The End of Paganism

UNDER Constantine the Church and the Empire were allied; under Theodosius they were incorporated together. Orthodoxy became the badge of a Roman citizen; the Catholic Faith the legal religion of the Romans. The State was responsible for the maintenance of the true Faith among its subjects. In 380 Theodosius ordered all nations to receive the Faith taught to the Romans by St. Peter and still held by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria. With the division of the Empire at the death of Theodosius, we note the tendency to the division of the Church, each part having its special problems and solutions.

(1) In the East. The larger life and the greater numbers of the Church were still in the East. Arcadius, the son of Theodosius, 395 to 408, his son Theodosius II, 408 to 450, Pulcheria and Marcian, 450 to 457, Leo I, 457 to 474, and Zeno, 474 to 491, form the series of emperors who weakly continued the line of Theodosius in the East. The laws of Gratian and of Theodosius were repeated and ex-

tended against apostasy and excluding pagans from civil and military offices, in 416. Renewing, in 423, a former edict against the pagans, it is said: "We believe that they are no more." The last edict of the Theodosian code forbids sacrifices on penalty of death, and orders the destruction of temples, if any exist. The brutal murder of Hypatia, the beautiful and learned teacher of Neo-Platonic philosophy in Alexandria, by fanatical monks (probably instigated by Bishop Cyril himself) in 415, was one of the last terrible incidents of the struggle, and brought down the censure of all the rest of the Christian Church. The practical downfall of paganism may be said to date from the middle of the fifth century. It was now almost wholly confined to remote rural districts, the very name paganism signifying the religion of the peasants or country-folk. The last decisive blow in the East was struck by Justinian who ordered all his subjects to be baptized, and in 529 abolished the philosophical school of Athens and exiled the seven remaining philosophers, "the shades of the seven sages of Greece." They fled into Persia, where they laid the foundation of the later literary activity of Islam under the rule of the Abassidæ at Bagdad in the eighth century.

(2) In the West. Honorius, 395 to 423, Valentinian III, 423 to 450, and (with the exception of Majorian, 457 to 461) their almost unknown successors down to Romulus Augustulus in 476, the creatures of Ricimer and Orestes, maintained a similar policy, though

under very different conditions. Stilicho, as regent during the minority of Honorius, forbade the destruction of temples and statues and protected the ancient games. But he alienated the Christians by his indifference, by the introduction of pagans into the imperial service, and by the reform of the episcopal courts. After the murder of Stilicho, the ecclesiastical party was again in the ascendant; temples and their incomes were confiscated, while bishops were entrusted with the execution of religious law. The hopes of the pagan party revived when Alaric placed Attalus on the throne. But Alaric soon threw him aside; and with his fall the last hopes of paganism as a political force in Italy vanished. Valentinian III joined with Theodosius II in an edict ordering the burning of all writings against Christianity. It was during this period that temples and statues of the deities, the most beautiful remains of ancient art, were ruthlessly destroyed. Note the destruction of the Serapeum in Alexandria and the activity of Martin of Tours in Gaul. In the West, however, paganism maintained itself until the middle of the sixth century, and even later among many of the cultivated and old aristocratic families in Rome, in some remote places, and in popular heathen customs and traditions. But Roman paganism in the West fell with the Roman Empire and was buried in its ruins. The German barbarians destroyed idolatry with the Empire and really promoted the victory of Christianity; for their leaders generally spared the

churches but spoiled the temples. A severer attitude was manifested by the Empire toward the Jews. Honorius and Theodosius the Younger excluded them from military and all other public services except municipal offices, while a special law gave temporal officials the right to inspect and increase the taxes paid into the public treasury by the Jewish communities. Constantine and his sons had prohibited the Jews from punishing those leaving their faith, from circumcising their slaves, and from marrying Christian women, and had forbidden conversions to Judaism. There was no additional legislation from Julian to Theodosius.

§2. The Ecclesiastical Organism

During this period the patriarchal system was strengthened and confirmed, while the influence of the hierarchical constitution of the Empire increased and became more evident.

The decree of the Second General Council making Constantinople the fourth patriarchate was not pleasing to the Bishop of Rome, as it created a new rival to his growing power; nor to the Bishop of Alexandria, who had previously held second place and was now relegated to the third. The new patriarch began to extend his powers over the neighboring metropolitans and the other eastern patriarchs, owing largely to the fact that it was the custom for the eastern bishops to reside at Constantinople in order to be near the emperor who frequently referred their cases to the Bishop

of Constantinople and his council. The patriarch thus gained the primacy of the East and gradually extended his recognized authority over twenty-eight provinces. In 421 Theodosius II issued an edict establishing his authority to ordain bishops in all the neighboring dioceses. This was formally sanctioned by the Fourth General Council at Chalcedon, 451 A.D., in the twenty-eighth canon, confirming the third canon of Constantinople. This aroused the jealousy of the Bishop of Rome, especially as the canon of Chalcedon was silent in regard to the primacy of St. Peter, and appeared to base the preëminence of both Rome and Constantinople upon pure political considerations. From this point begins the final separation of the East from the West, which belongs to the succeeding history. The Fourth Council also assigned to the Bishop of Jerusalem the three provinces of Palestine and confirmed him in his patriarchal rank, which had been vaguely recognized by the Council of Nicæa only as a position of honor. Thus the Catholic Church of the fourth and fifth century was organized with increasing definiteness under five co-ordinate and independent patriarchs, four in the East and one in the West, under whom are most of the metropolitans, a few, like Milan and some others, maintaining an original independence, while under the metropolitans were bishops who controlled the presbyters and deacons, and administered the affairs of their episcopal parishes. Synods were held in the metropolitan and patriarchal districts, while the general councils ut-

tered the voice and proclaimed the decisions of the universal Church. But the analogy of the political constitution and the tendency toward a visible, tangible representation of the unity of the Church, like that of the Empire, impelled from oligarchy to monarchy, especially in the West, where already there was only one patriarchate. The division of the Empire after the death of Theodosius and the other circumstances of the time only increased this tendency, but at the same time implied a double head to the hierarchy, one representing the Western or Latin Church, and the other the Eastern or Greek Church.

§3. The Roman Primacy and the Origins of the Papacy

The establishment of the basis of the papal power belongs essentially to this period. The germs of authority, the lines of influence, the elements of authority appearing in the preceding period were drawn together, confirmed, consolidated and even extended and still further developed in this period; mainly by two great Popes, Innocent and Leo. In consequence of the division of the Empire, the claims of the Roman patriarchate to ecclesiastical supremacy over the whole of the West were not only confirmed but considerably extended. These claims were advanced with strong emphasis and corresponding success by Innocent I, 402 to 417 A.D. On his elevation to the episcopate he authoritatively transferred to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, as his representative,

the oversight of all the Illyrian provinces, and to his successor, in 412, he sent a formal document creating him "vicar of the Bishop of Rome." He applied to the Roman See the Sardican canon of 343, giving right of appeal in certain cases to Julius; and in a decretal to a Gallican bishop he enlarged the right of appeal of condemned bishops into an obligation to submit all major cases to the decision of the Roman See. From Africa a Carthaginian synod in 404 sent messengers to Rome to secure its intercession with the emperor against the Donatists; from the East, Theophilus of Alexandria and Chrysostom of Constantinople solicited the influence of Rome in the Origenist controversy. Alexandria of Antioch boasts of asking the advice of the Bishop of Rome on constitutional and disciplinary matters. Appeals from Palestine and Africa came in 415 and 416 during the Pelagian controversy; and when the decision was given against the Pelagians Augustine made the well-known declaration, "Rome has spoken; the case is ended." But when Zosimus, Innocent's successor, took the side of Pelagius he was forced to retract; and, in the case of Apiarius, the Council of Carthage at which Augustine was present, 418 A.D., forbade any appeal to transmarine tribunals, and Rome's quoting of the Sardican canon as Nicene was strenuously resisted. Celestine I, 422 to 432 A.D., again protected Apiarius, but another Carthaginian synod protested and denied again any Nicene authority for the Sardican canon. In the Nestorian controversy, both Nestorius and

Cyril of Alexandria appealed to Rome, where the flatteries of Cyril won great favor; and Celestine commanded Nestorius, under threat of deposition and excommunication, to present within ten days to a Roman synod a written retraction. To his legates at the Council of Ephesus, 431 A.D., he gave instructions to guard the authority of the Apostolic See and to pass judgment on their opinions, but not to submit to any discussion. The council decided as Celestine willed; the Alexandrian patriarch recognized Rome as the highest court of appeal, and a Roman-trained adherent of Celestine was raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople in place of the deposed Nestorius.

Celestine's successor, Sixtus III, 432 to 440, boasted of his superiority to the council; and in honor of his victory dedicated the church now called St. Maria Maggiore. Leo the Great, 440 to 461, the greatest Roman Bishop up to the time of Gregory the Great, was the most successful and the worthiest vindicator of Roman authority in the East as well as in the West, and may fairly be regarded as the real founder of the Roman papacy as a universal episcopate with the full sanction of the civil power. In him the idea of the papacy became flesh and blood. He adopted the interpretation of Matt. xvi: 18 as divine authority for a universal primacy, and proceeded to realize it in practice, basing his claims upon it, as may be seen in many of his sermons. He forced into flight Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, who tried to maintain a sort of primacy in Gaul; he estab-

lished the privilege for African bishops to appeal to Rome; he obtained, in 445, from Valentinian III, emperor of the West, an edict recognizing the primacy of the Apostolic See, declaring that "no one may attempt anything against its authority; and whatever shall be sanctioned by that authority shall be law and all." But his greatest triumph was secured at the Fourth General Council at Chalcedon, 451 A.D., the first general council at which a Roman legate presided. Here Leo's letter to Flavian was approved by the council and made the basis of its doctrinal decision against Nestorius and the Monophysites. Hardly less triumphant was his stand against Attila and the Huns in the attack upon Rome in 452; and though less successful in withstanding the Arian Gaiseric and his Vandals in 455, he showed clearly his ability and authority in restoring order and quiet after the fourteen days of murder and pillage. Leo was every inch a Pope, and both in theory and in practice he established and maintained the supremacy of the Roman See, the true incarnation of ancient Rome. When the acts of the Council of Chalcedon were sent to Leo for confirmation, he expressly repudiated the twenty-eighth canon increasing the dignity and importance of the See of Constantinople, and the emperor annulled it in 454 and Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople, consented to its erasure, but his successors maintained its validity and the canon went into effect. In this connection, the peculiar position of Milan toward the end of the fourth century is sig-

nificant, appearing first in the time of Ambrose (347 to 397). Indeed, there came into existence a two-fold hegemony in the Western Church,— Rome and Milan. Even before the middle of the fourth century, Milan was the great centre of ecclesiastical interrelations in the West. Spain, Gaul and Africa all appealed to Milan, partly because it was an official imperial residence, although the Church was not founded there before the end of the second century. When Treves ceased to be an imperial residence at the death of Maximus, in 388, Milan became the capital of the Western Empire, and its ecclesiastical position was established on the same lines as Constantinople. There, rather than at Rome, the two Churches of the East and West found a point of contact. The Bishop of Rome therefore helped to found Aquileia and Ravenna at the expense of Milan. Under Zosimus a great blow was struck at Milan by the foundation of the Vicariate of Arles. Its final submission to Rome came in the pontificate of Gregory the Great.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Hussey, R.—The Rise of the Papal Power. pp. xxix-xliii; 1-150. Lond., 1863.
Lea, H. C.—Studies in Church History. pp. 112-140.
Flick, A. C.—Rise of the Mediæval Church. pp. 148-185.
Bright, Wm.—The Roman See in the Early Church. pp. 148-185.
Wells, C. L.—Age of Charlemagne. pp. 14-24.
Littledale, R. F.—The Petrine Claims.
Gore, Charles.—Leo the Great. Lond., 1878.
Rivington, Luke.—The Roman Primacy (430-451). Lond., 1899.
Allies, T. W.—The Throne of the Fisherman. Lond., 1887.
Mann, H. K.—Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages. Lond., 1906.

§4. The Invasion of the Germans

The great wandering of the German peoples and their settlement within the boundaries of the Empire had a tremendous influence on the history of Christianity and the organization of the Christian Church. Gradually the German tribes had been moving down from the far North, forming great confederations as they drew nearer to the boundary of the Empire. In the Northwest were the Saxons, southwest of them along the lower Rhine the Franks, further up the Rhine the Alemanni from whom the French derived their name for the Germans, later, between these two, came the Burgundians, giving the name of Burgundy to the valley of the Rhone, east of them were the Bavarians, and farther east, along the Danube, the Visigoths and Ostrogoths. Driven by the Turanian hordes of Huns from the far East, the Visigoths had utterly defeated the Roman army at Hadrianople in 378, and the Emperor Valens had lost his life. From this battle dates the great invasion, and the Germans came swarming into the Empire. Theodosius held the Goths in check while he lived, making treaties, settling them in border lands, the Visigoths in Thrace and the Ostrogoths in Pannonia along the Danube, giving them the name of *Foederati*. Already many of them were serving in the Roman armies. But at last under the great Visigothic leader Alaric they began a new invasion. At this date, 395 A.D., Theodosius died, and his death, for many reasons, marks

the close of an epoch in the world's history. He was the last to hold in one grasp the undivided Empire, and under his successors the Empire in the West rushed impetuously to its fall. Honorius, his son and successor, shut himself up in Ravenna and left the defence of the Empire to his Vandal general Stilicho, who for thirteen years had been the foremost person in the Empire next to Theodosius. Twice did he defeat Alaric, in 402 and in 403, and again in 405 he annihilated the Ostrogothic army of Rhadagais near Florence. At this time the Vandals, a nation of the eastern Germans, following the Goths, crossed the Rhine, and passing through Gaul and Spain with fearful devastation (which has made their name the synonym of wanton destroyers), passed into Africa, leaving their name in the province of Andalusia. Meanwhile the weak Honorius, influenced by the enemies of Stilicho, put that great general to death in 408, and thus destroyed one of the last great protectors of the Empire. Hearing of this, Alaric returned, and, unopposed, twice entered and sacked the city of Rome, in 409 and in 410. His successor Athaulf led his triumphant host into Gaul, where they settled on the Bay of Biscay, with Toulouse as a capital, and thus established, 415 A.D., the first Germanic kingdom on imperial territory, continuing in Gaul until conquered by the Franks in 507, and in Spain until the conquest by the Mohammedans, 711 A.D. The Vandals, having crossed to Africa, established their kingdom there under Gaiseric in 429, lasting

until overthrown by Justinian's generals, 534 A.D. The kingdom of the Burgundians, the scene of the Nibelungenlied, established in 443, was in its turn conquered by the Franks, 534 A.D.

A new peril now approached from the East. The Huns, driving the Goths before them, settled on the Danube at the time the Goths, by the victory at Hadrianople, had crossed into the Empire; but now, under Attila, encouraged by the Vandal Gaiseric, they swept acoss the Rhine into Gaul, plundering and destroying and gathering in allies as they went. Here they were met by the Roman general Aëtius with the Roman "foederati" under him,—Visigoths, Burgundians, Alemanni and Salian Franks,—while under Attila fought Huns, Ostrogoths and Ripuarian Franks. The battle, one of the great decisive battles of the world's history, called the "Battle of the Nations" (usually known as the battle of Châlons), was fought at Méry on the Seine, 451 A.D. The next year Attila attacked Italy, destroyed Aquileia and took up his residence at Milan. Here he was visited by Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, and induced to return to his home beyond the Danube, where he died in the following year, and his immense following was dispersed. At this time also, 449 A.D., the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes began their conquest of Britain.

Once more the jealousy of a Roman emperor brought about his ruin. Aëtius, called the last of the Romans, was assassinated by the order of Valentinian III in 454, and in the following year the Senator

Maximus murdered the emperor and took his place on the throne. The empress, it is said, called to her aid the Vandal Gaiseric, who with his host crossed over from Africa and took possession of Rome, 455 A.D. Here he was met by Leo the Great, and his fierceness somewhat mitigated, though Rome suffered plunder and spoliation. The next year he was conquered by Ricimer, but remained master of Africa and the Western Mediterranean until his death, 477 A.D. Ricimer died in 472, and the conquest by the Herulian Odoacer in 476 ended all semblance of Roman power in the West. Thus German peoples of different names had established their kingdoms in all parts of the Western Empire; and at last the end, for which it had been preparing for so long, had come. Various reasons for, and accounts of this downfall have been given. It is one of the most instructive facts in history. The main cause was exhaustion. Internal life had perished; luxury, taxation, war and slavery had sapped the life forces of the Empire. Thus Rome fell, but in falling left the rich treasures of her civilization, her organization, her language and her laws as a legacy in trust to the Christian Church and the German peoples.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Hodgkin, T.—Italy and Her Invaders. 8 vols. Oxford, 1899.

Allies, T. W.—The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations. pp. 1-65. Lond., 1888.

Adams, G. B.—Civilization During the Middle Ages. pp. 65-88.

Emerton, E.—Introduction to the Middle Ages. pp. 11-113. Boston, 1888.

§5. St. Patrick and the Islands of the West

Little is known of the origin of Christianity among the Britons. The first missionaries undoubtedly came from Gaul, for it was with Gaul that they then had ecclesiastical relations. We have the memory of the three martyrs of the Diocletian persecutions, Alban, Aaron and Julius (though Constantius did not enforce the edicts in his provinces), also the three bishops at the Council of Arles in 314. Some were present at Sardica in 343 and at Rimini in 359. Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, visited the British churches in the last quarter of the fourth century. Twice in the fifth century Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre,— in 429 with Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, and in 447 with Severus, Bishop of Treves,— visited the churches of Britain to counteract the teachings of Pelagius, a British monk (though perhaps of Irish birth). But the invasion of the Picts and Scots on the north and west and of the Jutes, Angles and Saxons on the east destroyed the Roman institutions, wiped out cities and provinces, and overthrew the local Church and the episcopal organization. When a little order was restored, the religious grouping had for centres certain monasteries, where the remnant of the clergy was absorbed by the monks; but when Augustine landed in Kent in 597 he found only a few British Christians in the far west of the island. We have a few remains of six or eight British churches, notably at St. Martin's, Canterbury, and at Silchester in Hampshire; and

about fifty relics of various kinds are thought to bear indications of Christianity. Probably no Church in the world has left in the region which it once occupied so few traces of its existence. Some traces remain of the work of a British bishop, Ninius or Ninian, among the southern Picts from about 400 to 430 A.D. The centre of his mission was in what is now the little town of Whithorn, where he built a stone church called Candida Casa, dedicated in the name of his friend Martin of Tours whose death had recently occurred. The island of Erin (Hibernia), where the Romans had never set foot, also remained outside of Christendom. In 431 it was reported at Rome that Christianity had reached the Scots (the island was called Scotia and the people Scots in the fifth century and later). Palladius was consecrated at Rome to be their first bishop, but it is doubtful if he exercised his bishopric there. The true Apostle of Ireland was Patrick. Amid the many legends, absurd and ridiculous stories which have obscured his real greatness and the rare beauty of his character, it is now possible to trace the outlines of his true history. The place of his birth is disputed, but may have been Bannaventa Berniæ, or Deventry, west of Northampton. His father was a deacon and a decurion, his grandfather a presbyter. At the age of sixteen he was kidnapped by a band of Scots and carried to Ireland where he remained six years. Here he decided on his future work, and having made his way home to get the proper preparations he was consecrated bishop

and returned to Ireland, c. 432, where he served a long and arduous episcopate but with brilliant success until his death, c. 460 A.D. Before he came, he said, the only gods of Ireland were idols; before he left it was a land of Christian people. He had baptized thousands, ordained many clergy, consecrated large numbers of monks and virgins. His writings show him to be a large, generous soul, seeking after God, anxious for the welfare of others, feeling a deep spiritual fatherhood for his people. Patrick laid the foundation of Christianity in Ireland so broad and deep that in the sixth century Irish monasteries were centres of study where books and masters abounded. Men went there for instruction even from Britain and the continent.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Todd, J. H.—St. Patrick the Apostle of Ireland.
Stokes, G. T.—Ireland and the Celtic Church.
Stokes, Whitley.—The Tripartite Life of St. Patrick.
Bright, Wm.—The Roman See in the Early Church. pp. 357-421.
Stories of the Nations.—Ireland. Chapter IV.

§6. Origenistic Controversies

The most distinguished defenders of Nicene orthodoxy,—Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregorys, Hilary and others,—all held Origen in high esteem. But the constant reference to his authority by the Arians tended to make him an object of suspicion to the extreme orthodox. In Palestine he had warm supporters,—John, Bishop of Jerusalem, Jerome and

Rufinus. But Jerome, finding his orthodoxy questioned on account of his championship of Origen, prepared to change his attitude. The leader of the opposition was Epiphanius of Cyprus who travelled about denouncing Origen as the father of error. Rufinus and Jerome were estranged by the controversy and denounced each other bitterly. Siricius and Anastasius, Bishops of Rome, took part in the controversy and it spread to Alexandria where Theophilus drove out the Origenist monks and condemned Origen, 399 A.D., in which he was supported by Epiphanius, Jerome and Anastasius. The monks found refuge with John Chrysostom in Constantinople. Theophilus aroused the clergy, the empress and the court against Chrysostom, and at the "Council of the Oak," 403 A.D., pronounced his deposition and banishment. Recalled in a few days he was banished again, 404 A.D., and died in Pontus, 407 A.D. The controversy was renewed in the next century, and fifteen propositions ascribed to Origen were condemned at a synod in Constantinople in 544. His name fell into disrepute and many of his works perished. It has remained for modern times to revive his greatness and to show his true worth as one of the world's scholars and thinkers.

§7. Augustine and the Theology of the West

Western theology had its head, its chief exponent and defender as well as its organizer in Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, 395 to 430 A.D. His conversion,

387 A.D., marks an epoch in the history of the Latin Church. His whole life is a picture of the age and in it can be seen in miniature the crisis through which the world and the Church were passing. He was educated as a rhetorician and was familiar with Latin literature, though he knew Greek only superficially and Hebrew not at all, using Latin versions of writings in these languages. He was a great controversialist, and had not the constructive power of a consecutive thinker. His opinions were formed in the heat of debate and in the exigencies of argument rather than in the calm, deep process of speculative thought and analysis. He carried with him the scars of his contests. His earlier Manichæism lent an unconscious coloring to his maturer views. Hence he was not always consistent. To the extreme contradictory on one side he gave the extreme contradictory on the other. Against the Manichæans, he maintained individual freedom of the will; against the Pelagians, the absolute sovereignty of God, and against the Donatists, the authority of the Church. Also, against the Manichæans he maintained the negative character of evil, but against the Pelagians the physical transmission of sin. He had all the fervor and energy of the African style, though he wrote a purer and more powerful Latin. He is the summit and the source of the development of the Western Church. From him descended the mysticism no less than the scholasticism of the Middle Ages; he was one of the strongest pillars of the papal Church, and from

his works, next to the Bible, the Protestants drew their strongest convictions and interpretations. His has been called one of "those minds in which a hundred others dwell." Origen and Augustine alone, of all the theologians of the first six centuries, became the creators of distinct systems each proceeding from its definite idea and each completely carried out. Indeed each illustrates that fundamental difference between the Eastern and Western type of mind and form of thought which ultimately led to the final separation into the two Churches. Beside the difference in language (not merely in form but in spirit and power), the West was practical, formal, legal, literal, material, active and utilitarian; while the East was speculative, mystical, philosophical, spiritual, contemplative and idealistic. The West centred its theology about man and his salvation; the East found the centre of its theology in the Being of God, His Person and Nature.

Augustine was born in 354 at Tagaste in Numidia, near Hippo. His father was Patricius, a heathen; his mother, Monica, a Christian, one of the most beautiful characters in history. He was educated in the schools of Madaura and of Carthage, and went to Rome as a teacher of rhetoric. Wild and lawless in his youth, he was roused to higher things by the reading of Cicero's Hortensius (now lost). He became a Manichæan in 373 and remained under that influence from his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year, as an 'auditor' (catechumen). Then he

became a sceptic, but soon turned to Platonism. From Rome he went to Milan and fell under the influence of Ambrose. The strong, practical, eloquent assertion of authority won him. In September, 386 A.D., he tells us that he heard a voice saying: "Take and read." He took up the book lying near him and read Romans xiii: 14. He yielded, and was baptized by Ambrose, Easter, 387 A.D. On his way back to Africa his mother died in his arms, the prayer of her life answered. After four years he was ordained presbyter at Hippo, and in 395 was consecrated Bishop of Hippo where he remained until his death, 430 A.D., while the Vandals were thundering at the gates of the city. The writings of Augustine, numbering more than a thousand titles, extending over forty-four years, are a mine of Christian knowledge and experience. The wide range and great fertility of his genius may be seen from this list of his principal works as outlined by Schaff: I. Autobiographical. (1) The Confessions, one of the most celebrated works of religious genius. (2) The Retractions. Written 427 A.D., a revision and correction of all his former writings. (3) The Letters (nearly three hundred), from 386 to 429 A.D. II. Philosophical Treatises. Early, and mostly Platonic. III. Apologetic. Against Pagans and Jews. (1) The City of God. A celebrated philosophy of history, justifying the fall of Rome. IV. Theological — General and Special. (1) Against the Manichæans. (2) Against the Pelagians. (3) Against the Donatists. (4) Against the Arians, and

several against other heretics. (5) The Trinity. (6) Christian Doctrine. V. Exegetical. Genesis. VI. Ethical and Practical. Nearly four hundred sermons, moral treatises, etc. It was most significant that the Augustinian system of theology, the Latin Bible of Jerome and the papal organization of the Church appeared just in that transitional period of history in which the old civilization was passing away before the flood of barbarism.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack, A.—History of Dogma.
Schaff, P.—History of the Church. Vol. III.
Schaff, P.—St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine. N. Y., 1891.
Clark, W. R.—St. Augustine. (S. P. C. K.) Lond., 1881.
Bright, Wm.—Athanasius, Chrysostom and Augustine. Lond., 1890,
Moule, H. C. G.—St. Augustine.
Cunningham, Wm.—St. Austin's Place in Christian Thought.
Allen, A. V. G.—Continuity of Christian Thought. pp. 3-15; 130-172.
See also the next two sections.

§8. The Donatists

The schism of the Donatists is one of the most characteristic and instructive movements in the fourth and fifth centuries. It involved all the questions raised by the new relations between the Church and the Empire, brought about by the conversion of Constantine and the increased importance of the organization of the Church. How far was actual holiness essential to the reality of membership in the Church

and to the validity of the functions of the clergy? How far must the inconsistency go to justify separation? In other words, What is the relation of the invisible, spiritual Church to the visible, outward organization? How far are they identical? It was natural that these questions should arouse most interest and come most squarely to an issue in the North African Church, whose earliest great spirit, Tertullian, had been the avowed spokesman of the similar movement of Montanism in the second century, and whose next great teacher, Cyprian, had aroused the opposition of Novatus and his followers in the third century. As the schism of Novatus arose out of the circumstances of the Decian persecution, against the mild treatment of the lapsed, so the schism of the Donatists arose in the Diocletian persecution; when many of the *traditores* gave up heretical books to the agents of the government, who did not know the difference. To the more rigorous this appeared as an unworthy evasion. Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, and his archdeacon, Cecilian, later his successor, were accused of this evasion and also of opposing the extravagant honors given to confessors, and the excessive belief in the efficacy of relics. The rigorous party chose Majorinus, and when he died, in 315, Donatus was put forward against Cecilian. On account of the zeal and ability of Donatus his name was given to the schism. The schismatics under Majorinus appealed to Constantine soon after the battle of Milvian Bridge. He appointed three bishops

of Gaul to arbitrate. They, with fifteen Italian bishops, met at Rome, under the Bishop of Rome, and acquitted Cecilian and made provision for the Donatist bishops. But these were not satisfied, and the whole matter was referred to a synod at Arles, in 314, the first council ever called by imperial authority. Here the preceding judgment was confirmed and the principle laid down that the sacraments of ordination and baptism were valid, even when baptism was administered by a heretic and ordination by a *traditor*, if the person ordained was duly qualified. The Donatists again appealed to the emperor who upheld the decision of the council, and proceeded to deprive them of their churches, exiling their leading bishops and even putting some to death. This roused them to fury and put them in a position of antagonism to both the Church and the Empire. In this revolt they were joined by bands of fanatical ascetics, called 'circumcellions' because they went about among the barns (*cellas*) of the peasants inciting them to revolt and stirring them up to deeds of violence and brutality, inspired by communistic notions similar to those in the peasants' war in Luther's time. Constantine then decided, 321 A.D., to use milder measures. He repealed all the edicts against them and permitted the return of their bishops, exhorting the Catholics to be patient and leave them to the judgment of God. At a Donatist synod in 330 two hundred and seventy of their bishops were present, though there were only two congregations outside of Africa,—one in Spain

and the other in Rome. Constans in 348 attempted to restore peace. But Donatus resisted by force; many of his followers were executed, many exiled, among the latter Donatus himself, and for a time the Donatists were reduced to silence and secrecy. But under Julian, according to his policy to let the Christians fight among themselves, all were restored and the struggle was renewed. Donatus died in exile and Parmenian succeeded him as Donatist Bishop of Carthage. Gratian in 378 issued an edict forbidding all assemblies of the Donatists and confiscating their churches. Augustine began a twofold campaign against them; by trying to convert them, and by raising the standard of Christian life in his own community, so that their puritan objections would have no justification. Their two characteristic tenets were: a Church which tolerates sinners ceases to be a true Church; and those who come over from such a Church must be re-baptized.

Honorius, in 398, issued an edict against them. A synod at Carthage in 404 invoked the secular arm against them and Honorius continued his edicts against them from 405 to 407. Milder measures followed in 409, though soon withdrawn, and a conference was held by order of the emperor at Carthage in 411, a hundred years after the beginning of the schism. The decision of the imperial delegates was given in favor of the Catholics. This was followed by another edict against the Donatists, confirmed in 412, forbidding their assemblies, confiscating

their churches, inflicting heavy fines on all, banishing the bishops persisting in the schism and depriving all schismatics of civil rights; and later, in spite of Augustine's protest, forbidding them to assemble under pain of death. Many hundreds returned to the Church. From this time their numbers continued to diminish, until, in the terrible invasion of the Vandals, 428 A.D., "Donatists and Catholics alike were lost in the Arian Cloud."

SPECIAL REFERENCE

Holms, L. R.—The Extinction of the Churches in North Africa. Lond., 1898.

§9. The Pelagian Controversy; Semi-Pelagianism

While the East was engaged in the great Christological controversy, the West was occupied with the great Soteriological controversy regarding sin and salvation. Before Augustine, the teaching of the Church on this subject was exceedingly crude and indefinite. The Greek, particularly the Alexandrian, Fathers, in opposition to the dualism and fatalism of the Gnostics had laid great stress on human freedom and its coöperation with divine grace; while the Latin, especially the North African, Fathers emphasized the hereditary sin and guilt of man and the sovereignty of God's grace. The one is called synergism, the other divine monergism. Pelagianism asserted on the other side a human monergism. The Eastern controversy,

as to the relation between the divine and the human in the person of Christ, inevitably involved the application of the same issue in all the relations of humanity to God, where the divine and human meet. Thus the Pelagian controversy was, after all, the Western, or practical, form of the same question which appeared in the Eastern, or Christological, form. It was assumed in the Pelagian controversy by both parties, by Augustine as well as by Pelagius, that whatever was ascribed to the human agency in the matter of salvation was so much taken from the divine; what was done by man, whether in conversion or in human history, appeared to be so much done without God; what was done by God was as some external action, outside and independent of man. The perplexities and inconsistencies are due to the failure to maintain the distinction, without the separation between the human and the divine. Leo perhaps wrote wiser than he knew when he sent his famous letter to the Council of Chalcedon declaring that the divine and human were not to be mingled or confounded, while yet they were not to be separated or divided.

Pelagius was probably a British monk, perhaps of Irish descent. The original form of his name seems to have been Morgan (Marigena; in Greek, Pelagios). He was born c. 350 A.D. He was intellectual, pious, ascetic and peace-loving, learned in Greek philosophy. He went to Rome about 400 or earlier, and called forth no criticism until his follower, Celestius, was attacked by Paulinus, one of Ambrose's

deacons who was in Africa looking after the affairs of the Church of Milan. At Rome, in 409, he issued his commentary on "St. Paul's Epistles."

Here he converted the advocate Celestius, a man of acute intellect and able in debate. To escape the dreaded Alaric, Pelagius went to North Africa in 410 and thence to Palestine. Celestius followed him to Carthage in 411, where he was opposed by Paulinus, and a local synod declared his opinions heretical and excommunicated him. He then went to Ephesus where he was ordained. But the struggle went on in the West, and then Augustine took it up. Pelagius went to Jerusalem and was approved at a synod held at Diospolis in December, 415, at which Pelagius repudiated the teachings of Celestius and by implication his own. Two African synods were held, one at Carthage, and one at Mileve, in 416, which condemned Pelagius and Celestius and sent the decrees to Rome. Innocent replied confirming their action. Augustine in one of his sermons uttered the famous words: "On this matter two Councils have been sent to the Apostolic See; the answers have arrived. The cause is ended; would that the error also might end." But Innocent was succeeded in 417 by Zosimus whom Duchesne calls "an anomaly." He was won over by Celestius, and a Roman synod upheld both the leaders. The Africans, however, secured a rescript from the emperor in 418, ordering the leaders to be driven out of Rome, their followers exiled and their goods confiscated; they also held an unusually large synod in

the same year to maintain their position against Zosimus. He was now induced to yield, and confirmed the condemnation. Eighteen Italian bishops refused to subscribe and were banished. Among them was Julian, Bishop of Eclanum, who continued to uphold Pelagianism; but we hear no more of Pelagius. Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, gave his protection to the exiled Pelagians, but this injured both of them, and at the General Council of Ephesus, in 431, Nestorius, Celestius and Pelagius were all condemned. A Semi-Pelagian party, however, arose in Gaul under John Cassianus, the champion and one of the founders of western monasticism. Vincentius Lerinesnis (Vincent of the monastery of Lerinum or Lerins) was the most famous of his followers, and laid down the principle that the Catholic Faith is that which "always, everywhere and by all" has been believed. Judged by this standard, however, Augustine's doctrine was by no means catholic. After Augustine's death Hilary and Prosper, two lay disciples, took up this cause. A presbyter, Lucidus, a zealous adherent of predestinationism, was forced to recant by a Semi-Pelagian synod at Arles, in 475, and in the same year a synod at Lyons sanctioned Semi-Pelagianism. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, and Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, set forth a moderate Augustinianism and won for it a victory at the Synod of Orange in 529, confirmed at the Synod of Valence in the same year and by Boniface II, of Rome, 530 A.D.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Harnack.—History of Dogma. V, pp. 3-261.

Schaff.—History of the Church. III, pp. 802-870.

Bright, Wm.—Anti-Pelagian Treatises of Augustine. Waymarks in Church History. Chapter VIII.

Mozley, J. B.—Treatise on Augustine's Doctrine of Predestination. Lond., 1878.

Mozley, J. B.—Ruling Ideas in Early Ages.

Souter, Alex.—Commentary of Pelagius on St. Paul's Epistles, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1905-1906. pp. 409-439.

§10. The Christological Controversy

(1) *The Nestorian Controversy and the Third General Council*

After the Council of Constantinople the difference between the two schools, the Alexandrian and the Antiochian, became more apparent. The speculative and mystical Alexandrian tended toward the Apollinarian emphasis on the divine; asserting the two natures before the Incarnation, but making the union so close after the Incarnation that the Virgin Mary was called the mother of God (Theotokos). On the other hand, the more literal, practical Antiochian school, with Theodore of Mopsuestia at its head, inclined to the other extreme of such a distinction between the two natures as amounted almost to a separation, with a tendency to emphasize the human in opposition to the Alexandrian over-emphasis of the divine. In both cases, the true meaning of the Incarnation was in danger of being lost: by appearing in the Alexandrian as a transmutation or absorption of the human into the

divine, and in the Antiochian as an indwelling of the divine in the human, or a moral union of the two persons. The difficulty was due in large measure to a failure to define accurately the terms 'nature' and 'person,' and to understand what unity between them implied. Nor was there an adequate empirical knowledge of human nature itself. Indeed, 'nature,' whether in God or man, owing to the tendency of defining spiritual things with physical terms, was conceived as a sort of physical essence. The controversy continued for over two hundred years with extraordinary violence. The Roman Church took a calmer but none the less definite part in the controversy and twice, — at the Fourth Council and at the Sixth, — decided the victory by the powerful influence of the Bishop of Rome. After the condemnation of the attempt of Apollinaris to explain and assert the divinity of Christ by the mutilation of His humanity, Nestorius, of the Antiochian school, so emphasized the human nature of Christ as to make almost a double personality. At first a monk, then a presbyter at Antioch, he became the Patriarch of Constantinople, 428 A.D. In his opening sermon he addressed the emperor with these words: "Give me the earth purified from heretics and I will give thee heaven. Help me to conquer the heretics and I will help thee to conquer the Persians." He was most bitter against all heretics, except the Pelagians. His own troubles began with opposition to the term Theotokos, which had been applied to the Virgin Mary by Origen, Alexander,

Athanasius, Basil and the other Alexandrians, in order to emphasize the divine nature of Jesus, but was now passing into the devotional language of the people with almost idolatrous signification. The Antiochian theology, however, could not conceive a human nature without a human personality, and this separated from the divine Logos. 'Theotokos' became the watchword in this controversy, just as 'homoousios' had been in the Arian. The opposition to it by Nestorius struck a double blow, against theological doctrine and against religious sentiment due to the growing veneration of the Virgin Mary. Theologically it weakened the doctrine and meaning of the Incarnation, by pressing the distinction of the two natures till it involved double personality. It made the Incarnation merely the bringing of a man into fellowship with the Logos,— the Person of Jesus a temple of the indwelling Logos,—a mere outward or mechanical union. His chief opponent was Cyril of Alexandria, learned and energetic but passionate and ambitious. Ecclesiastical politics and prejudices embittered the strife.

A synod at Alexandria, in 430, under Cyril, confirmed by Celestine, Bishop of Rome, condemned twelve of the propositions of Nestorius. Nestorius, supported by Theodoret and by John of Antioch, replied in like manner, and accused the Alexandrians of Apollinarianism. The two emperors, Theodosius II and Valentinian III, called a general council at Ephesus in 431. Jealousy, passion and intrigue marked its proceedings. Cyril of Alexandria presided.

Nestorius refused to appear, and the council was opened before John of Antioch and the Syrian bishops arrived. At the first session Nestorius was condemned and deposed. John arrived four days later and held a council of his own, at which he deposed Cyril and his chief supporter, Memnon of Ephesus. Two weeks later, two bishops and a priest, the delegates of the Bishop of Rome, arrived and supported Cyril. The emperor confirmed all three depositions, but later restored Cyril and Memnon. Nestorius retired to his former cloister at Antioch. In 435 he was banished to Upper Egypt, where, after suffering great indignities, he died, probably in 451. Two years later, after the council, a formula of union, asserting the union of the two natures and the 'Theotokos,' was drawn up by Theodoret and was accepted by both Cyril and John. Nestorianism did not come to an end on the condemnation of its founder. The Nestorians continued in Persia and spread through the East into China and India. They still remain in Armenia and the valleys of Hindustan and in Eastern India on the coast of Malabar.

(2) *The Eutychian Controversy and the Fourth General Council*

Though the Third Council had condemned Nestorius, nothing was done to determine the true doctrine on the subject of the two natures. As the Antiochian theology produced Nestorianism, which carried the distinction between the two natures to the extreme

of separation into two persons, so the Alexandrian produced Eutychianism, which emphasized the divine personality of Christ to the absorption of the human nature. Cyril died in 444, and was succeeded by Dioscorus, who surpassed him in his violent temper, but fell behind in intellectual and theological ability. Eutyches, an aged presbyter and head of a cloister at Constantinople, brought the extreme Alexandrian views to a head and declared that, after the Incarnation, there was only one nature, the impersonal human nature being assimilated and deified by the personal Logos, even His body being a divine body. Eutyches was condemned at a local synod of the patriarch Flavian, held at Constantinople in 448, and both parties appealed to distant bishops, particularly to Leo, Bishop of Rome. Leo replied in a letter to Flavian which has become a classic statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation and was made the basis of the decision at Chalcedon. Theodosius, at the instigation of Dioscorus, called a general council at Ephesus in 449. A hundred and thirty-five bishops attended. Dioscorus presided, aided by a band of brutal monks and armed soldiers. Amid the greatest violence and confusion, which made the council a scandal to the Church, only one side was heard; Eutyches was upheld, and Theodoret, Flavian, Ibas and others were deposed. Flavian died of the wounds which he received. Leo showed his masterly ability, dignity and boldness in his protests against what he called a Council of Brigands, and used the occasion to enhance

the authority of the Roman See. Marcian, who succeeded Theodosius II, in 450, summoned a new council to meet at Nicæa in 451, moved as he says, "by the letters of Leo, the most holy Archbishop of Rome"; though in truth Leo would have preferred to hold it in the West. The turbulence of the bishops at Nicæa led to their removal to Chalcedon, right opposite Constantinople, to secure the presence of the emperor. In attendance it far exceeded any other council of the ancient Church, and in doctrinal importance, is second only to the First General Council. Estimates of the number of bishops vary from 520 to 630, though all, except the Roman delegates and two Africans, were Greeks and Orientals. The imperial commissioners conducted the proceedings and a Roman delegate for the first time presided. The proceedings were tumultuous and undignified. At the first session the decisions of the "Brigands" were annulled, the martyr Flavian declared orthodox, Dioscorus deposed and Theodoret restored after anathematizing Nestorius. At the second session, the Creed of Epiphanius, presented by Cyril of Jerusalem at the Council of Constantinople and there approved as orthodox, was presented as the Creed of Constantinople, and approved side by side with the original Creed of Nicæa which it afterwards supplanted until it is now known as the Nicene Creed (with the addition of the "filioque" clause made in the sixth century and incorporated by Charlemagne). At the same time the Letter of Leo to Flavian, "The Tome of Leo," was

read and approved as the "Faith of the Fathers," and later the important words of Leo's epistle were made the decision of the Council. The symbol was then solemnly ratified. Ibas was restored and twenty-eight canons passed. The emperor by his edicts gave the force of law to its decisions and ordered all Eutychians to be banished and their writings burned. Leo accepted and confirmed all the acts of the council except the 28th canon which placed the Patriarch of Constantinople on an equality with him. This council did not end the controversy. Its decisions were regarded by the Egyptian party as completely Nestorian. Indeed the Chalcedonian definition has been called "a Roman formula forced on the Oriental Church by imperial authority." Its decisions passed through the fiery opposition of the Monophysite and Monothelite controversies which convulsed the Eastern Church for more than two centuries, and left many still unconvinced and unreconciled.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

DuBose, W. P.—The Ecumenical Councils: The Epochs of Church History. Vol. III.

Allen.—Christian Institutions. pp. 374-381.

Baker, J. F. Bethune.—Nestorius and His Teaching. Camb., 1908. Based on the recently edited Apology of Nestorius.

Dorner, J. A.—Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Div. II, Vol. I, pp. 1-119.

§11. The Canon of Scripture

Although practically settled in the last half of the second century, there were in the fourth century

differing views regarding the exact number of strictly canonical books. In the Old Testament the books of the Hebrew Canon had the highest authority, but the list in the Greek version of the Septuagint, called the Alexandrian Canon, comprised additional books, not accepted by all, but regarded as valuable for historical and devotional purposes. Still other books had some circulation but were generally regarded as spurious. Jerome, however, applied the term Apocrypha to all books not in the Hebrew Canon. The current Latin Bible, however, was a translation from the Septuagint indicating no variations in degree of authority; and the great leaders of the Latin Church were unwilling to draw distinctions which might shake the received tradition. Augustine took this position and (doubtless under his influence) the Third Council of Carthage, in 397, authorized the Alexandrian Canon of the Septuagint, and that usage was followed, though the tradition of Jerome's distinction was kept alive and is followed in the English Church. The books generally circulated as the New Testament, Eusebius divided into three classes — Accepted, Disputed and Spurious. From the time of Irenæus the four Gospels, The Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews (authorship uncertain) I Peter, I John, and the Apocalypse, were generally accepted, and so classified by Eusebius, though there was some hesitation about the Apocalypse on account of its contents. There was still some uncertainty in regard to the Epistle of James, II Peter,

II and III John, and Jude; and Eusebius classified them as Disputed. The Acts of Paul, the Epistle to the Laodiceans, Shepherd of Hermas, Apocalypse of Peter, Didache, Epistle of Barnabas and I Clement were read in the churches but not regarded as having any claim to canonicity, and so were classified as Spurious.

Most of the uncertainties regarding the seven books about which there was some dispute, — i.e., the five "Disputed" and the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, — were cleared away or disregarded, and the seven were included with the acknowledged books of the New Testament. In the Western Church the canon was closed at the end of the fourth century by Jerome and Augustine, at the Council of Carthage, 397 A.D., following the Alexandrian Canon for the Old Testament and the complete canon of the New Testament as we have it to-day. This was confirmed at Rome by Innocent I, 414 A.D.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Sanday, W.—Inspiration. Lond., 1896.
Westcott, B. F.—The Bible in the Church. (See Special References, A. II, §11.)

§12. The Sacraments

While nothing was definitely established as to the exact nature and number of the Sacraments, the increasing importance of Confirmation, as a rite separated from Baptism, and of Ordination, and the Christian sanctity of Marriage, tended to bring all three of

these within the list of Sacraments, or solemn acts of worship in which special grace was communciated, according to the definition of Augustine,—"a visible sign of an invisible grace." He speaks of Baptism and the Eucharist as the chief Sacraments and expressly names Confirmation, Ordination and Marriage as Sacraments. Other writers of the period speak of one, or of all three of these as Sacraments. Dionysius, the neo-Platonistic Christian Mystic, falsely called the Areopagite, whose writings belong probably to the last part of the fifth century (or early sixth), enumerates six Sacraments: the Eucharist, Baptism, Confirmation, Anointing of the Dead, Ordination of Priests, and Ordination of Monks. (Monks were ordained after 385 A.D.) Others mention Feet Washing. After the fifth century the number seven was generally accepted but not definitely fixed until the twelfth century. Baptism was usually administered at Easter, less frequently at Pentecost. Adults who wished to be baptized gave their names as catechumens or hearers. Not all were admitted; those who were had to have sponsors to testify to their good intentions. At first the catechumenate lasted two or even three years, but toward the end of the fourth century the time was shortened and forty days became the usual time. Daily instruction was given, and they were frequently exorcised. In the last week, on Thursday, they bathed, on Friday and Saturday fasted, on Saturday were exorcised, and, after midnight, came to the baptistry bringing a loaf

of bread for the Eucharist. (The Baptistry is described in §15.)

Sometimes, not always, there was a blessing of the water. The bishop blessed two oils, of exorcism and of anointing. Each candidate, or, in case of an infant, a sponsor, turned to the west and renounced Satan; was then anointed with the oil of exorcism, by the presbyter in case of males, in case of females by one of the widows, or a deaconess, behind a veil. Then turned to the east saying, "I submit to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," etc. The presbyter and the deacon then took the candidate into the water, and as faith was professed in each of the three parts of the Apostles' Creed, the candidate was dipped, making a threefold immersion; after which the candidate was anointed by the presbyter with the second oil, and all went into the church for the Confirmation; the bishop laying on one hand, sometimes two hands, invoking the Holy Ghost and pouring on oil, sealed the newly baptized on the forehead and gave the kiss of peace and benediction. The Eucharist followed. The close connection of Baptism, Confirmation, and Communion, even of infants, at the same time is found in all the Church Orders of the third and fourth centuries and is still the custom in the Eastern Church. The Council of Elvira, 306 A.D., provided that those baptized by a deacon should be confirmed later by the bishop. Baptism by deacons was forbidden, however, by the Apostolic Constitutions, but was allowed to presbyters, while Confirmation

came to be an essentially episcopal act in the West; not in the East where presbyters still continued to administer it. Ordination in the three orders consisted of a single prayer with laying on of hands or usually of one hand. In the minor orders, including deaconesses and official widows, only a special prayer was used, without the laying on of hands, until the Apostolic Constitutions. The bishop was to be chosen by all the people. However, a canon of Laodicea (c. 380 A.D.) says: "The choice to any order in the priesthood shall not rest with the multitude." In some cases one bishop acts, in others, three bishops lay on hands. The custom of presbyters assisting at the ordination of a presbyter by laying on of hands is very ancient. The bishop acts alone in ordaining a deacon.

The anointing of the sick with oil, as means of charismatic bodily healing, is found down to the fifth century. Innocent I put it in a decretal of 416 A.D. for the first time as a sacrament for the dispensation of spiritual blessing to the sick. But Extreme Unction was not regarded universally as one of the regular Sacraments of the Church until the twelfth century. Although the doctrine of the Eucharist was not a subject of theological controversy or of ecclesiastical action until the time of Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century, elements of the doctrine of the Real Presence are clearly found, and a decided tendency toward the theory of transubstantiation appears in Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Hilary of Poitiers,

Ambrose and Leo the Great; though the change they teach is more dynamic than substantial. The Nestorian Controversy strongly influenced the Eucharistic theories. The view of this service as a sacrifice in the technical sense of the word is not found in any of the Church writers of the first three centuries except Cyprian, but was now becoming more prominent and was strengthened by the tendency toward transubstantiation.

The last half of the fourth century was the beginning of an age of ritual activity. 'Liturgy' means in technical, ecclesiastical language, the order and administration of public worship,— particularly the celebration of the Eucharist. There were probably no liturgical books in the Ante-Nicene period, though there were of course liturgical forms. In each church a fixed order of worship gradually developed, which, in apostolic congregations, went back to an apostolic origin, enlarged and altered as time went on, but, until the fourth century, perpetuated only by oral tradition. For the celebration of the Sacraments belonged to the *Disciplina Arcani*, and was concealed from Jews, Pagans, and even from catechumens. But when Christianity was legalized in the Empire, and the Church made a public appeal to the people, the administration of the Sacraments, and the worship generally, became a public act open to all. Consequently, we find in the fourth and fifth centuries a number of written liturgies bearing in most cases apostolic names, but rather as belonging to

Apostolic Churches than as having an apostolic origin. They seem to be based on a common liturgical tradition reaching back to the earliest times. Otherwise their affinity with each other cannot be satisfactorily explained. This common type is seen in the earliest account which we have of the service, in Justin Martyr's Apology, 152 A.D. In its earliest complete written form it is found in the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, probably about the middle of the fourth century, and called the Clementine Liturgy. It is confirmed by the last of the lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem to his catechumens, 347 A.D. The most important orthodox liturgies are: (1) The Jerusalem Liturgy, ascribed to St. James. (2) The Alexandrian Liturgy, to St. Mark; probably compiled by Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444 A.D. (3) The Byzantine or Constantinopolitan, to Basil the Great and Chrysostom. (4) Milan or Ambrosian. An Oriental form adopted in the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies. (5) The Roman, seen in the Sacramentaries of Leo, Gelasius and Gregory.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Maclean, A. J.—Recent Discoveries. pp. 5-37; 59-72.
Harnack, A.—History of Dogma. IV, pp. 268-303.
Brightman.—Liturgies: Eastern and Western.
Brett.—Collection of the Principal Liturgies. Lond., 1838.
Neale, J. M.—Tetralogia Liturgica. Lond., 1859.
Palmer, W.—Origines Liturgicæ. 2 vols. Lond., 1845.

§13. Worship; Rites and Ceremonies; Services and Liturgies

Until the last quarter of the fourth century, except perhaps in one or two places, the Eucharist and its vigil were the only regular public services; and the Eucharist was not celebrated daily until the fifth century. Even at the end of the fourth century daily services were by no means universal, and were not introduced at Rome until well on in the fifth century. Daily prayers were held for the presbyters and for the official widows; and the laity had private prayers at various hours of the day,— on rising, and at the third, sixth and ninth hours, to which were added sunset and midnight. The full development of daily services is to be traced to the rise of religious communities at the end of the fourth century. These services consisted of Prayers, Psalms, Hymns, Canticles (Nunc Dimittis and Benedictus) with Responses. There were no lections from the Bible except at the Eucharist. The regular division of the Psalter dates from about 385 A.D. The earliest arrangement provided for the whole course of the Psalms once in three days; later, once a week. Vigils were services kept up though the night; usually before Epiphany, Good Friday, Easter-even, Easter and Pentecost. It is to be noted that according to Eastern reckoning the day began with sunset, and the evening service of a Sunday or festival took place on what we should call the evening before. There was from early times a

symbolical or ceremonial use of lights, but they were not confined to the Eucharist. It is probable that the whole or the greater part of the service was sung; but there is no trace of instrumental music until a much later date, although choirs of trained singers came early into use, antiphonal chanting by two choirs being introduced at Antioch about 350 A.D. The Litany, a form of alternative prayer in which the people respond to each clause by the repetition of a short and expressive formula, dates from early times, though originally confined to the Eucharist. Later it was used on the occasion of penitential supplications and processions, probably instituted by Liberius of Rome, 352-366 A.D., on the three Rogation Days before Ascension Day, and revived by Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, 470 A.D.

Kneeling was the usual posture in prayer, except on Sundays and between Easter and Pentecost, when the people stood. The sign of the cross, the kiss of peace and washing of hands were in general use. Blessing the water dates from the last part of the fourth century, though holy water was much later. Incense dates from the fourth century. The date of the origin of vestments is not known. They naturally took on greater richness and splendor in the fourth and fifth centuries (cf. Ambrose and the Church of Milan). Constantine gave to the Bishop of Jerusalem a splendid stole wrought with gold for use at baptisms. Vestments were derived from dress once general among the upper classes of the Empire,

though always white. The long tunic was called ecclesiastically the 'alb,' and worn with a girdle. The toga or upper garment was called the 'chasuble' or 'planeta.' The orarium or stole was worn over the left shoulder by the deacon, and over both shoulders by the presbyter; the maniple, a similar short strip, over the wrist. The dalmatic was worn by the bishop, who also wore a special ring and carried a crozier. The pallium, at first of linen, later of wool, was worn by the archbishop.

In the fourth century preaching was still regarded as a special function of the bishop, but not to the entire exclusion of the presbyters. No layman, not even a monk, was permitted to preach in a church. Preaching was frequent in the great town churches but rarer in the villages.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Maclean, J. A.—Recent Discoveries. pp. 87-116.
Marriott, W. B.—Vestiarium Christianum. Lond., 1868.
Duchesne, L.—Christian Worship. Trans. Lond., 1903.

§14. Saints, Relics and Images

The veneration of martyrs and of saints was early paid to their memory. Worship was held at their graves, and chapels built for their remains and for this worship. Prayers were said for them, but (as interpreted by Cyril of Jerusalem) in order that through their intercessions God might receive our prayers. Augustine, however, declared it an insult to pray for them when we needed their prayers for

ourselves. Thus they came to be regarded as heavenly powers, protecting the faithful and hearing their prayers. So Ambrose and Jerome and the three Cappadocians taught. This veneration was soon extended to their earthly remains or relics, that is, bones, clothing, furniture or instruments of their martyrdom. At the close of the fourth century we begin to hear of the very cross on which Christ was crucified, the nails, etc., with the legend of the discovery by the Empress Helena, Constantine's mother, 326 A.D.[1] Later the crown of thorns (preserved in Paris) and the coat (at Tréves). Beginning in a natural religious feeling of reverence and gratitude, it soon led to superstition and idolatry. The first clear trace of the veneration of relics is seen in Antioch, in the second century, in connection with the bones of the martyr-bishop Ignatius, and of Polycarp in Smyrna. By the middle of the fourth century the superstitious worship is evident. Remains were dug up and sold by wandering monks, the trade leading to many frauds and counterfeits; but the genuine could be discovered, it was believed, by the miracles they wrought. The exhuming of remains was forbidden by Theodosius in 386, and by several councils, but without success.

Anthony and Athanasius protested against relic worship, but opposition soon ceased except on the part

[1] Stanley.— Eastern Church. pp. 211. D. C. B. Vol. II. p. 882, b.

of heretics. The feasts of martyrs became popular festivals, with eucharists and banquets. By the end of the fourth century the feast of All Saints was celebrated in the Greek Church on the Octave of Pentecost, and was fixed in the West on November 1, by Gregory III, 731 A.D. High above the veneration of the saints rose that of the Virgin Mary, though the martyrs came first in the development of saint-worship. Her absolute sinlessness and perpetual virginity were not yet matters of faith. Her adoration (which does not appear to any great extent before the fifth century) was enhanced by the mystical view of the Incarnation as the deification of humanity. Even before the time of Athanasius the Virgin Mary had been designated the mother of God (Theotokos), but in the Nestorian Controversy this became the popular name for her, and churches were dedicated to her. From the adoration of saints arose naturally a certain adoration of angels. The Synod of Laodicea protested against this; yet Origen commended the invocation of angels, and Ambrose represented it as a duty. Holy places, consecrated to the life of our Lord and of the early saints, were made the objects of pilgrimages. The Empress Helena set the example by her visit to the Holy Land, 326 A.D. The use of pictures and images in worship at this early stage belongs rather to the subject of worship than of art. The earliest symbol or image was naturally the cross; it was made of wood in the second and third centuries, later of silver and gold adorned

with pearls and precious stones. Chrysostom says the cross is found everywhere. Nilus, d. 450, one of the fathers of monasticism, says a cross might be placed at the east end of the church, and scenes from the Old and New Testaments painted on the side walls. These pictures from the time of Constantine were usually made in mosaic. The earliest images of Jesus were Gnostic. Two have been found dating about the middle of the fourth century; one (a statue of the Good Shepherd), preserved in the Vatican, and the other on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, d. 359. Eusebius denounced pictures, even of the Apostles; but Basil the Great, before the end of the century, acknowledged them; showing what a change had taken place during the fourth century. Images of the Virgin are found earlier, on the reliefs of the sarcophagi, where she is represented veiled. Pictures of the Apostles, especially of St. Peter and St. Paul, are found in the fourth century. The earliest references are in a description by Gregory of Nyssa, d. 395. Paulinus of Nola, d. 431, describes vividly the scenes from the Old Testament painted on the walls of his church of St. Felix in Nola, near Mt. Vesuvius.

Already, in the early part of the fifth century, Augustine complained of the superstitious reverence and undue honor paid to pictures and images. The development from the cross to the crucifixion took place mostly in this period in four stages: (1) The simple cross; (2) Cross with lamb at the foot of it (early fifth century); (3) Christ clothed, on the

cross, not nailed to it — at first only the head and shoulders (fifth century); (4) Christ nailed to the cross, but alive with open eyes (sixth century). The dead Christ on the cross does not appear until the tenth or eleventh centuries. Consecrated gifts appeared in the churches from the time of Constantine and became numerous by his example. Memorials of cures appeared in the fifth century in the form of feet and hands, etc., of gold and silver.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Appell.—Christ in Mosaic Pictures.

Woltmann and Woermann.—History of Painting. 2 vols. Lond., 1886.

Lindsay.—Christian Art.

Vaughn, H.—Life of the Blessed Paulinus. Lond., 1854.

Bigg, Charles.—Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History. pp. 27-56. N. Y., 1906.

Milman.—History of Christianity. Bk. IV, ch. iv.

§15. Christian Life and Discipline

We note a twofold aspect of morality after the Church became imperial and the State officially Christian. Much of the earnestness, power and purity of the Christian life was lost. The Church became more assimilated to the world. Church discipline grew more lax; moral deterioration set in.

The prevalence of dogmatic disputes and the political influences at work tended to produce ambition, greed and bitterness among the clergy, and hypocrisy, pride and bigotry among the laity; not to mention the grosser sins incident to the influence of court

life and the savagery resulting from the raids of the barbarians. Donatism, Priscillianism and monasticism were, each in its way, a protest against the growing laxity of the Church during this period. On the other hand, Christianity acted as a leaven in society, strengthening the administration of justice, raising the standards, ennobling the motives and increasing the enthusiasm of life. As shown in B. I, §15, the precepts of Christian morality tended to become a code of positive law. The needs of humanity and the rights of man were recognized; the condition of slaves and captives was ameliorated; gladiatorial shows and immoral exhibitions were abolished; the sanctity of marriage was insisted upon; the elevation of woman secured; benevolent institutions and care for the poor, sick and aged, children, criminals and unfortunate was provided, and the inveterate vices of ancient paganism were condemned and discredited. Second marriages were regarded with disapproval even for a widow or widower. In the fourth century innocent spouses, legally divorced for adultery, were still allowed to remarry, though (as in all cases of second marriage) they were advised against it. But in the fifth century, by the Synod of Mileve, 416 A.D., and by Innocent I, divorced persons, even though innocent, were for the first time forbidden to remarry. Indeed there was a strong tendency to regard marriage as a necessary evil suited only to the great mass of mankind who could not rise to the higher perfection. Thus the Church's estimate of the moral life

was shaped by the same theories that made monasticism appear as Christian perfection and the priesthood as in itself a representative of the higher religious morality. Jovinian, a monk, d. 406 A.D., whom Neander likens to Luther, combated these notions of double morality, in which the work-righteousness of the Church culminated; but he was bitterly opposed by Jerome and all who were devoted to the monastic ideal, and was condemned by Ambrose and Siricius. Helvidius, Vigilantius and Aërius, also opposed this monastic tendency. Of course the social misery and unrest, the storms and threatening dangers of the barbarians had much to do with this disposition to forsake the world. As for the ordinary Christian, his defects might be supplemented in two ways: by the merit of orthodoxy; and by that of churchly deeds,—prayers, fasting and almsgiving. Church discipline had two forms: the ban, or greater excommunication, for notorious sins (exclusion from the Church, and, later, prohibition of all intercourse in civil life); the lesser excommunication, for slighter ecclesiastical offences, excluded from the Lord's Supper and the general Church prayer. For restoration, exercises of penance were required. Augustine distinguishes three kinds of penance: (1) Of catechumens, where all previous sins are washed away in baptism; (2) Of believers, whose venial sins, due to the universal sinfulness of human nature, obtain forgiveness by daily prayer; (3) Penance of those who commit the gravest sins, punished by excommunication and re-

mitted after public and formal penance. Heresy was regarded as the most grievous and unpardonable sin, and, as in the case of the Priscillians, was even punished by the State with death; but with the increasing severity against heretics strictness in regard to moral offences diminished. In the new world-Church, including more or less the whole population, the carrying out of this procedure became increasingly difficult.

A change had taken place from the original purpose of ecclesiastical penance,— of preserving the community from public scandal,— and it became a means for the improvement of members, and a standard of ecclesiastical penalties was fixed. This effected several changes from earlier usage: (1) Only one repentance had been allowed, but more than one must now be permitted. (2) The publicity of the penance, necessary to the original purpose, now became an obstacle in the way. Immediately after the Decian persecution, when large numbers of the lapsed sought return to the Church, a discreet presbyter was chosen to arrange the penance after a private hearing. This custom became general, and penitentiary presbyters were chosen to avoid the scandals of a public confession. There was no obligation of confession, but an opportunity was afforded. This institution was abolished by Nectarius of Constantinople, 391 A.D., in consequence of a scandal there, and many bishops followed his example, and the matter of communicating was left to each one's conscience; though a penitentiary priest was

appointed in Rome in the latter part of the fifth century.

Leo the Great condemned the custom of having penitents recite aloud in the church a complete list of their sins, and declared private confession to the priest to be sufficient. Public confession became rare after this. Almsgiving or bequests to the Church came to be recognized as a means of atoning for sin. Offerings were made also for the departed.

SPECIAL REFERENCES

Writings of Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom and Augustine.
Milman.—History of Christianity. Bk. IV, Chapter I.
Lecky, W. H. H.—History of European Morals.
Ozanam.—History of Civilization in the Fifth Century.
Dill, S.—The Last Century of the Roman Empire.
Bright, Wm.—Waymarks. pp. 243-278.
Burkhardt.—Slavery in the Roman Empire.

270.1R
124510
270.1R
W465
C.2
Wells, C.L.
Manual of Early Ecclesiastical History.
124510
270.1R
W465
C.2